

The Classical Review

FEBRUARY, 1913

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

SOME NOTES ON THE *BUCOLICI GRAECI*.

II. THEOCRITUS XIII—XXIII.

XIII 10 ff. *χωρίς δ' οὐδέποκ' ἦς, οὐδ' εἰ μέσον ἄμαρ ὄροιτο*
οὐδ' ὄκχ' ἃ λεύκιππος ἀνατρέχει ἐς Διὸς
ἰώης,
οὐδ' ὄποκ' ὀρτάλιχοι μινυροὶ ποτὶ κοῖτον
ὀρώιεν,
σεισαμένας πτέρα ματρὸς ἐπ' αἰθαλόεντι
πετεύρωι,
ὡς αὐτῷ κατὰ θυμὸν ὁ παῖς πεποναμένος
εἶη,
αὐτῷ δ' εὖ ἔλκων ἐς ἀλαθινὸν ἄνδρ'
ὑποβαίη.

ὄροιτο 'hurried' seems to me unsuitable in 10, and *ὀρώιεν* 'looked' in 12. The *πέτευρον* is a perch or shelf or coop high up on the outside of the house near the smoke-hole or chimney. When the mother hen flaps her wings as she settles for the night, the chickens, if their action is to be used as a sign of approaching night, must be supposed to do something noticeable to the onlooker. 'Looking towards their roost' is hardly that. The similarity of endings in ll. 10 and 12 may well have caused corruption. Read in 10 *ἄροιτο* 'had risen,' 'had climbed,' and in 12 *ὄροιεν* 'rushed,' the former from *αἶρω*, the latter from *ὄρυνμι*, intransitive as in Hesiod *Scut.* 437. For the confusion between neighbouring similar words cf. the Oxyrhynchus fragment (694) of this poem, which has confused *ἴκοντο* and *ἔθεντο* in ll. 29 and 30, reading *ἴκοντο* in both. The chickens go scurrying up the ladder or slanting board to join their mother in the coop. Delete the comma at the end of l. 12

NO. CCXXXI. VOL. XXVII.

and take *ἐπ' αἰθαλόεντι πετεύρωι* with *ποτὶ κοῖτον ὄροιεν*.

In l. 14 the emphatic position of *αὐτῷ* is justifiable; it belongs to *κατὰ θυμὸν*. In l. 15 it is not. The scholia preserve in l. 15 the reading *αὐτῷ* in the sense of *αὐτόθεν*. This will do well if we translate 'pulling a straight furrow from the outset,' comparing the scholion *εἴρηται μεταφορικῶς ἀπὸ τῶν βοῶν τῶν ἐκ νεοῦ εἰθισμένων καλῶς ἔλκειν*.

23 *ἀλλὰ διεξάιξε βαθὺν δ' εἰσέδραμε*
Φᾶσιν
αἰετὸς ὥς μέγα λαῖτμα· ἀφ' οὗ τότε
χοιράδες ἔσταν.

So the MSS. Wilamowitz follows Jacobs in transposing the latter halves of the lines; other editors put *βαθὺν δ' εἰσέδραμε Φᾶσιν* into a parenthesis; Ahrens considers ll. 22-4 spurious. The chief difficulties are the hiatus in 24, and the fact that *λαῖτμα* elsewhere means a gulf of the sea and therefore cannot go closely with the eagle. There are plenty of parallels, however, to the hiatus; and there is no reason why Theocritus should not choose to employ *λαῖτμα* in the sense of an abyss; Homer's frequent use of it with the qualification *θαλάσσης* or *ἁλός* would justify an imitator in employing it of another element. *τότε* cannot be right. Read *τόθι* 'there,' and take *χοιράδες* as predicate. There is no *ὑστερον πρότερον* within the lines themselves. The poet is speaking not so much of the arrival at Phasis as of the passing of the *συνδρομάδες*; the words *βαθὺν δ' εἰσέδραμε Φᾶσιν* make one idea with

A

διεξάιξε. Nor are the lines out of place in the poem. It is true the Hylas-episode took place before the *συνδρομάδες* were passed, but the poem is not a history of the Argonauts but a description of that episode, and ll. 22-4 merely serve to identify the Argo for the reader. It may be objected that this explanation requires Πόντον not Φᾶσιν. But βαθύν, which, as its position shows, is predicate, saves the situation; the Pontus is looked upon as the Bay of Phasis.

XIV 44 εἴκατι· ταὶ δ' ὀκτώ, ταὶ δ' ἐννέα, ταὶ δὲ δέκ' ἄλλαι, σάμερον ἐνδεκάτα· ποτίθες δύο καὶ δύο (Κ δέκα) μῆνες ἐξ ὧ ἀπ' ἀλλάλων.

Cholmeley 'Aeschines counts the days by groups marked by subsequent events: "twenty days up to then—then eight till I—," and so on.' So too apparently Lang. But surely it is absurd to imagine that the time is partitioned in Aeschines' recollection by events which took place respectively eight, nine, and ten days apart, and in that order; and moreover there is the difficulty of the ordinal ἐνδεκάτα. Read εἰκάδι and ποτίθες δέκα καὶ δύο μῆνες. 'Let me see, it was the twentieth of the month; eight, nine, ten,—to-day's the eleventh. You've only to add ten days and it will be two months since we parted.' The quarrel took place, say, on the 20th Thargelion; to-day's the 11th of the next month but one, Hecatombaeon; in another week, as we should say (literally, according to the Greek tripartite division of the month, in another ten days), it will be the 20th of this month; that is, it will be two months since the 20th of Thargelion. The corruptions were due to a desire to make the numbers total 60, δύο μῆνες. For ten days as a round number corresponding to our week cf. X 12 ἔραμαι σχεδὸν ἐνδεκαταῖος, where σχεδὸν shows this.

XV 7 ἂ δ' ὁδὸς ἄτρυτος· τὸ δ' ἐκαστέρω (ἐκαστοτέρω) ἔμ' ἀποικεῖς.

Read ἐκαστάτω ὡς ἐναποικεῖς, 'the street's unending and you live ever so far along it,' literally 'it is very far where you live in it.' Cf. τυτθὸν ὅσον ἄπωθεν I 45. For ὡς 'where' cf.

I 13. The confusion between comparative and superlative terminations is common enough (cf. l. 139); the *ω* of ὡς was lost by haplography; ἐμ' for ἐν- was meant for ἐμοῦ and was due to the comparative. For the compound ἐναποικεῖς cf. ἐνδιαθρύπτει III 36 'give yourself airs with respect to,' which does not occur elsewhere.

16 πάντα νίτρον καὶ φύκος ἀπὸ σκανῶς ἀγοράσδεν.

Wilamowitz' πάππα (cf. πάππα· Συρακοσίον *Etym. Mag.*) is excellent; I would add in support of it that the infinitive for imperative is baby-language, as in Theophr. *Char.* 7. 10. The mother uses baby-language to the father, as mothers still do.

25 [ὦν ἴδες, ὦν εἶπες: for 'sight seen's tale told' in my translation I would substitute a friend's suggestion 'sight-seers make good gossips.']

27 [Please read αἰνόδρυπτε for the misprint αἰνόδρυπτε in my edition.]

50 πάντες ἐρινοί. Read ἐρεινοί, explained—but in the less likely form ἐρινοί—by Hesychius as καινοί, which is just what is wanted, 'queer,' the Greek immigrant's estimate of the native. ἐρινοί, adopted by Wilamowitz in his second edition, is unnecessary, and doubtful in view of XXV 250, where the wild-fig is used for a chariot-wheel.

77 'ἔνδοι πᾶσαι' ὁ τὰν νυὸν εἶπ' ἀποκλείξας.

Editors have boggled needlessly, I think, over ἀπο-. It is 'the man who shut the bride away from the bridesmaids' by shutting the door of the wedding-chamber, thus leaving the pair alone together. The circumstances here shown by τὰν νυὸν are left to indicate what in XVIII 5, Τυνδαρίδα κατεκλείβετο, is shown by the Middle. (The bridegroom probably said πάντες, but the gender would vary according to the application of the proverb.)

85 Add to the note: for the omission of κλίνας cf. Plato *Symp.* 185d.

123 ff. ὦ ἔβενος, ὦ χρυσός, ὦ ἐκ λευκῷ ἐλέφαντος αἰετοὶ οἰνοχόον Κρονίδαι Διὶ παῖδα φέροντες, πορφύρεοι δὲ τάπητες ἄνω μαλακώτεροι ὕπνω.

ἡ Μίλατος ἐρεῖ χῶ τὰν Σαμίαν κατα-
 βόσκων
 ἔστρωται κλίνα τῷδ' ὠνιδι τῷ καλῷ ἀμά
 (MSS ἀλλά).
 τὰν μὲν Κύπρις ἔχει, τὰν δ' ὁ ῥόδοπαχυν
 Ἄδωνις.

The first part of the description (dealt with sufficiently in the footnote to my edition) is in ll. 119-121, and speaks of the two canopies of greenery. The second part begins at ὦ ἔβενος and is concerned with the bedstead or couch as opposed to the bed or bedding which follows. The third part begins at πορφύρεοι δὲ τάπητες, the actual bedding or coverlets as opposed to the bedstead. The asyndeton after ὑπνω shows that the next lines belong to the description of the τάπητες 'softer than sleep, *aye, so soft that Miletus, etc.*' What Miletus and the grazier of Samos might well say consists of two lines ἔστρωται—Ἄδωνις. The κλίνα itself has been described in the two lines beginning ὦ ἔβενος; it is mentioned here only in conjunction with ἔστρωται, the two words together referring to the bedding, τάπητες. Line 128 still refers to the τάπητες. A misunderstanding of this led to the correction τὰν μὲν and τὰν δέ, though these obviously could not really refer to the single couch mentioned in the line above as having been made for Adonis (of course it is for Aphrodite too, but he only is mentioned because the marriage-bed was often said to be made for the *bridegroom*, cf. VI 33). Read τὸν μὲν and τὸν δ'. There were two canopies, one bedstead, and two lots of bedding or coverlets. The Greek coverlet was often called χλαῖνα, and in origin was doubtless merely the sleeper's cloak. (It would of course be impossible in a description of a mystic marriage to take κλίνα in l. 127 as dual.)

XVI 36 ff. πολλοὶ δὲ Σκοπᾶδαισιν ἐλάνοι μὲνοι ποτὶ σακούς
 μόσχοι σὺν κεραΐσιν ἐμυκήσαντο βόεσσι,
 μυρία δ' ἄμ πεδίον Κραννώνιον ἐνδιάσσκον
 ποιμένες ἔκκριτα μῆλα φιλοξένοισι Κρε-
 ὠνδαις.

The chief emphasis of course lies on πολλοὶ and μυρία, but there is also a contrast between the cattle which return to the homestead for the night, and the sheep which pass it in the open. In 22. 44 ἐνδιάσσκε is used intransitively of sitting out in the open air. Here it

is transitive, 'to watch flocks by night.' L. and S.'s 'drove afiel' (s.v. ἐνδιάω) can hardly be right. Cf. 17. 19 ἐδριάει active, but middle in Homer.

88 ff. The different departments of the wished-for prosperity of the πολῖται have each its label at the beginning—ἄστυα, αἱ δ' . . . μῆλων χιλιάδες, βόες δέ, νεοὶ δέ. All these are nominatives, suitable to the dative πολῖταις. If we keep ἀγροὺς δ' ἐργάζονται τεθαλότας, not only have we to supply a subject, but the parallelism of the syntax of the lines is completely spoilt. Theocritus must have written ἄγροι δ' ἐργάζονται τεθαλότες, using what is usually a middle as a passive. See the last note. This was quite enough to cause the corruption.

94 νεοὶ δ' ἐκπονέονται (MSS also ἐκπλέοντο, ἐκτελέονται) ποτὶ σπόρον.

We may account for the variants by reading ἐκπολέονται. The stress lies on ἐκ-, 'may the fallows be ploughed ready for sowing—not piecemeal, here a bit and there a bit, but—thoroughly and entirely as far as the eye can reach.' Cf. L. and S. s. πολέω and ἀναπολέω.

XVII 13 ff. Punctuate ἐκ πατέρων· οἶος μὲν ἔην. . . 'It (the honour given by Heaven) was from his parents,' i.e. in the blood. For πατέρες 'parents' cf. Longus 4. 33 τοὺς τῆς Χλόης πατέρας ἀναζητεῖν. οἶος may be taken as in the main exclamatory as οἶα must be in 34; but there is also a tinge of 'such,' as in ὥδε l. 40.

14 Lang sees a contrast between φρεσὶν ἐγκατάθοιτο and νοῆσαι, but Greek does not often emphasise a verb by putting it at the end.

35 ὄφελος μέγα γειναμένοισι: Theocritus is speaking of the honour Ptolemy gets from the Gods (12) through his parents (ἐκ πατέρων 13); ll. 13-33 are concerned with the father, and now he is bringing out the point with regard to the mother. She too has been a great boon to her offspring (generalising plural, or including Arsinoe). Read γεινομένοισι as in 75. The corruption was due to the great distance between οἶος μὲν (13) and οἶα δέ (34), and a misunderstanding of ἐκ πατέρων.

134 ἔτι παρθένος Ἴρις: 'yet-maiden' is nonsense here; either take ἔτι as equivalent to ἀέι as it is in *Epig.* 20 (Wil.) and *Epit. Bion.* 92, or read the Aeolic compound ἀνπαρθένος, Sappho 96.

XVIII 21 ff. ἡ μέγα κά τι τέκοιτ', εἰ
ματέρει τίττοι ὅμοιον.

ἄμμες δ' αἱ (MSS also γὰρ) πᾶσαι συνο-
μάλικες, αἷς δρόμος οὐτός
χρυσαιμέναις ἀνδριστὶ παρ' Εὐρώταο λοε-
τροῖς,

τετράκις ἐξήκοντα κόραι, θήλυσ νεολαία,
τῶν οὐδ' ἄν (MSS also οὐδ' ἄν) τις ἄωμος
ἐπεὶ χ' Ἑλέναι παρισώθη.

Lines 22-25 are explanatory of 21; we may therefore expect either γὰρ or asyndeton. Read a colon after ὅμοιον, and ἄμμες ταὶ πᾶσαι. This is nominativus pendens taken up by the genitive τῶν 'of these.' In 25 read οὐδ' ἦν. ἄν was a corruption of the correction ἦν 'if.' The time indicated is the recent past when Helen was still among them.

XXI 10 τοὶ κάλαμοι, τᾶγκιστρα, τὰ
φυκίοντά τε λήγα.

Wilamowitz suspects we should read λῖνα. This seems to me almost certain in view of Headlam's remarks *Journ. of Philol.*, 1907, p. 315, where he compares the Latin *linum*, and reads in various places λινόσαρκος, λινοπτόμενος, ἀμφί-λινά, λινωσμάτους. The masculine form λῖνος (sic) occurs *Georgon.* 2. 40. 3. So too in Mosch. *fr.* 3. 7 for the impossible δεινοθέτας read λινοθέτας 'setter of snares.'

13 νέρθεν τὰς κεφαλὰς φορμὸς βραχύς,
εἴματα πύσοι (MSS also πύσοι).

The fishermen are lying asleep, and this line supplements the description of their bed given in 7. Upon the dry seaweed (*βρυον αἶον*) was laid for a pillow a small mat (*φορμός*), and their εἴματα were πύσοι or πῦσοι. The Greek coverlet was in origin the sleeper's cloak and hence is often called χλαῖνα (18. 19 and *A. P.* 5. 169; see also 5. 10). εἴματα I therefore take to be coverlets and the πύσοι or πῦσοι to be the predicate, i.e. what they used for coverlets. Read πύσσοι 'pea-jackets' or 'frieze coats,' i.e. πύκιοι (cf. *πυκνός*, *πύκα*, and *ἄβυσσος* for *ἄβυθιος*), originally an adjective 'thick,' agreeing e.g. with *πέπλοι*. Cf. the goat's-hair cloaks of Verg. *Geor.* 3. 312 (*miseris uelamina nautis*) and Villoison's interesting note (quoted by Seiler) on Longus 3. 3, in which V. says that in his time they were still made in Ceos.

22 ψεύδοντ', ὃ φίλε, πάντες, ὅσοι τὰς
νύκτας ἔφασκον
τῷ θέρεος μινύθειν, ὅτε τᾶματα μάκρᾳ
φέρουσιν.

The imperfect ἔφασκον shows that ψεύδοντ' stands not for ψεύδονται but for ἐψεύδοντο, and is of the ἦν ἄρα type. 29 ff. A. ἄρ' ἔμαθες κρίνειν ποκ' ἐνύπνια; χρυστὰ γὰρ εἶδον.

οὐ σε θέλω τὼμῳ φαντάσματος ἡμεν
ἄμοιρον.

B. ὡς καὶ τὰν ἄγρην τῶνείρατα πάντα
μερίζεν.

οὐ γὰρ νικάξη κατὰ τὸν νόον οὗτος
ἄριστος

ἐστὶν ὄνειροκρίτας, ὁ διδάσκαλός ἐστι
παρ' ὧν νοῦς.

The crux is in 32. Asphalion says: 'Did you ever learn to explain a dream? I have had a fine one. I do not wish you to be without a share in my vision.' To which the friend replies: 'You share your catch with me, and in like manner you may share all your dreams. For . . . he is the best explainer of dreams who has wit for his teacher' (i.e. it's only a matter for ordinary common-sense). In the gap one would expect something like, 'and it will be worth your while, too, for, as the saying is. . . .' For οὐ γὰρ νικάξη read οὐ γὰρ σ' εἰκάσω, put a question-mark after νοῦς and for νόον read λόγον; 'For shall I not be making conjecture about you according to the saying . . .?' νόον originated in a gloss upon λόγον by someone who thought it meant 'reason,' connected it with νοῦς in the next line, and understood the sentence as 'I shall not yield to you in respect of intelligence,' which is of course impossible. This produced the emendation νικάξη intended for a Doric future of νικάω, 'you will not surpass me in intelligence,' an emendation to which the future, if nothing else, is fatal.

47 ff. Add to the notes on this passage, that εὐρὺν ἀγῶνα is a reminiscence of *Il.* 23. 253, where however it is used in a different sense, and for the appositional use cf. XXV 274 ἀργαλέον μάλα μόχθον, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἦν οὔτε σιδήρῳ | οὔτε λίθοις τμήτη, a close parallel in a very similar context.

53 εἶχέ με δέμα: the asyndeton has this effect, 'covered thick with gold—indeed I was afraid, etc.'

57 τῶγκίστρια: hook and other tackle, cf. τόξα = 'bow and arrows.' [Please correct misprint τῶγκίστρια in my edition.]

58 Add to the notes: cf. Theocritus XII 23 ἐγὼ δέ σε τὸν καλὸν αἰνέων.

XXII 76 οἱ δὲ θοῶς συνάγερθεν ὑπὸ σκιερὰς πλατανίστους κόχλου φυσηθέντος αἰε Βέβρυκες κομόωντες.

αἰε cannot be right; for XVII 107 is not really parallel. The fragment (32) of Alcaeus quoted by Hdt. 5. 95 contains the phrase κύτον ἀλκτορίν, which I translate 'nail-studded buckler,' comparing the Homeric ἐκέδασσε and ἐκεδάσθη for ἐσκεδ., κάπετος from σκάπτω, and the Latin *cutis* beside Archilochus' ἐγκυτί, and connecting ἀλκτορίν with Hesych. ἔκτορες' πάσσαλοι ἐν ῥυμῶι and Φάλλης adjective of Φέλλω = εἶλω or εἶλλω (cf. ἀολλής) 'crowded together' = Ionic ἀλής Hdt. 1. 133. 7 et al., here used in the single-consonant form (cf. ὄρρανος and ὄρανος, both Lesbian). In Theocritus we have the corresponding adverb ἀλῆ or ἀλεῖ 'thickly.' That a short-*a* form occurred outside Aeolic (though indeed an Aeolic form would do here) seems likely from the accentuation ἄλες in the MSS of Hippocrates, see Hoffmann, *Gr. Dial.* III p. 320. Translate 'thick-haired Bebrycians,' comparing *Il.* 2. 542 Ἀβαντες ὀπιθεν κομόωντες.

90 σὺν δὲ μάχην ἐτάραξε: cf. XXVI 13 σὺν δ' ἐτάραξε ποσὶν μανιώδεος ὄργια Βάκχῳ, and Dem. 55. 1277 ἵνα μὴ πάνθ' ἅμα συνταράξας λέγω. He 'made a muddle of' his fighting, i.e. dropped science and simply 'went for' his opponent.

151 γάμον δ' ἐκλέπτετε (MSS also ἐκλέψατε) δώροις: but the marriage has not yet come off: the brides are merely being carried away preparatory to it. Read ἐκκλέπτετε and see L. and S. s.v.

208 στήλην Ἀφαρτίου ἐξανέχουσιν | τύμβου ἀναρρήξας: ἀναρρήγνυμι is to break up, through, or asunder; read ἀναρπάξας comparing Pind. *N.* 10, 66 in a passage describing the same scene and doubtless in Theocritus' mind at the time of writing.

XXIII 5 Add to the notes, that Ahrens' βέλη ποτὶ καὶ Δία βάλλει involves an unlikely construction — it

would rather be βέλεσι Δία βάλλει — and Δία coming thus suddenly would almost certainly have an epithet.

8 ροδόμαλον: the apple or fruit of the wild rose. Far from giving an apple (the usual love-gift), he would not even give him so much as a 'hip' from the hedgerow; these are edible but make rather poor eating. The word, being a compound of μάλον, has more point in Greek than in English.

10 οἶα δὲ θηβυλέος ὑποπτεύησι κυναγῶς, οὕτως πάντ' ἐποίει ποτὶ τὸν βροτόν. ἄρια δ' αὐτῶι χεῖλεα καὶ κῶραι δεινὸν βλέπον εἶχεν ἀνάγκαν:

Editors rightly adopt θῆρ ὑλαῖος, ἄγρια, and βλέπος εἶχεν ἀνάγκας; but πάντ' ἐποίει ποτὶ τὸν βροτόν is surely corrupt also. The phrase πάντα ποιεῖν πρὸς is not in itself objectionable in the sense of 'oppose in every possible way,' cf. Plat. *Rep.* 416B μὴ τοιοῦτον ἡμῖν οἱ ἐπικούροι ποιήσωσι πρὸς τοὺς πολίτας. The nearest approach, however, to this use of τὸν βροτόν simply for τὸν ἄνδρα is XX 20 ἄρα τις ἐξαπίνας με θεὸς βροτόν ἄλλον ἔτευξε; but that is not really parallel, for it is indefinite. Read πάντ' ἐποπώπει ἐπὶ βροτόν 'but he eyed every man even as a beast of the field that suspects the hunter,' comparing IV 7 καὶ πόκα τήντος ἔλαιον ἐπ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀπώπει; where ἐπὶ must belong to the verb.

13 τῶι δὲ χολᾷ τὸ πρόσωπον ἀμείβετο, φεῦγε δ' ἀπὸ χρώς ὕβριν τᾶς ὀργᾶς ποτικείμενος. ἀλλὰ καὶ οὕτως ἦν καλὸς δ' ἐξόρπασ' ἐρεθίζετο μάλλον ἐραστάς.

Wakefield's περικείμενον is indispensable; something agreeing with 'him' is required, or else the subject of ἦν καλὸς would have been expressed. Read ὁ πρὶν (Ahrens) ταῖς ὀργαῖς περικείμενον, comparing Dem. 1470. 25 ὀργῇ περιπίπτειν, 'the colour of his cheeks fled from him because he was a prey to wrathful imaginings.' The ὀργαί are concrete instances of the ὀργή of the next line, where we must read ἐξ ὀργᾶς with Stephanus. The corruption in 13 came from 14 before 14 itself was corrupted.

18 οὕτω δ' ἀντέλοντο φωναί: this unmetrical reading was due to taking φωνᾷ as φωναί in an unusual phrase. Read ἀντέλλετο φωνᾷ, lit. 'arose in (respect of) voice,' i.e. 'lifted up his voice.'

21 οὐκέτι πάρ σε, | κῶρε, θέλω λύπης ποχολώμενος (λ corrected to ρ): editors rightly adopt γάρ σε and λυπῇν, but instead of reading κεχολωμένος, I would suggest ποθορώμενος 'I will no longer grieve thee with the sight of me.' The first corruption was due to the wrong division ποθ' ὀρώμενος, and this was followed by Doricising ποχ' ὀρώμενος; the other corruptions were due to an emendator who tried to get out of it the meaning 'I no longer wish for pain from you,' giving θέλω the construction of ἐπιθυμείν.

30 λευκὸν τὸ κρίνον ἐστί, μαραίνεται ἀνίκα πίπτει (MSS also πίπτει).
ἀ δὲ χιὼν λευκά, καὶ τάκεται ἀνίκα παχθῇ.

Lilies might perhaps be said to fade when they fall, but snow does not melt when it freezes. Some editors have therefore transposed πίπτει and παχθῇ, which makes fair sense but weak sentiment. For πίπτει read ἀπανθεῖ, and for παχθῇ read ἐπιπνεῖ, and (with Wilamowitz) κατατάκεται. 'The lily is white, and yet it fades when its flowering is done; and white the snow, and yet it melts away with the breath of a fair wind.' ἐπιπνεῖ is impersonal, 'it blows fair,' cf. σείει, συννένοφε, ἐχείμαζε, and others quoted by Kühn.-Bl. 2. 1. p. 33, and also χειμαίνοντος Theocr. IX 20. Owing to the unusual impersonal use, ἀνίκα ἐπιπνεῖ was corrupted to ἀνίκα πίπτει (snow does fall); wrong division changed ἀνίκα ἀπανθεῖ to the meaningless ἀνίκα πανθεῖ; and the transposition was due to an emendator who vaguely preferred to associate freezing with snow rather than with flowers.

43 χῶμα δέ μεν κοῖλόν τι (MSS also τὸ), τὸ μεν κρύψει τὸν ἔρωτα: read δέ μοι (so Musurus; μεν came from μεν κρύψει) κοῖλον, 'hollow out, make a hole in, some bank.' κοιλῶ is a rare word, and this caused κοῖλον to be taken as an adjective and altered to agree with χῶμα.

44 With the corruption of χῶτ'

through confusion with χῶμ' above, cf. XIX where χὰ μάτηρ in l. 7 changed δς to χῶ in l. 8. I suspect a similar corruption in VIII 28, 29. Read also κείσο for κείσαι, the briefest possible form of funeral oration, which is just what the context requires.

48 ff. Read λίθον εἶλεν, ἐρεισάμενος δ' ἐπὶ τοίχῳ
ἄχρι μέσων οὐδῶν, φοβερὸν λίθον, ἄπτει
ἀπ' αὐτῶν
τὰν λεπτὰν σχοινίδα κ.τ.λ.

The MSS ὁδῶν is merely a false-epic diaeresis. Wilamowitz's προθύρῳ is apparently due to a notion that a rope could not be tied to a threshold nor a stone leaning against the wall be 'in the midst of the threshold.' Surely this is pressing literalness too far. The plural shows that the threshold is used loosely for the doorway, and any phrase that will emphasise the fact that the stone was in the very doorway is in point. The door of course remains shut till l. 53; the rope is obviously intended to be tied not to the lintel but to the projecting cornice supported on brackets, which may be seen on the vases, e.g. Brit. Mus. F 124 reproduced in my edition of the *Characters* of Theophrastus, p. 41.

54 ff. οὐδ' ἐλυνίχθη (MSS ἐτυλίχθη)
τὰν ψυχάν, οὐ κλαύσε νέον φόνον, ἀλλ'
ἐπὶ νεκρῷ
εἴματα πάντ' ἐμίανεν ἐφαβικὰ βαῖνε
δ' ἐς ἄθλα (MSS ἄθλω)
γυμναστών.

He does the exact opposite of what the lover hoped in ll. 38 and 39; he neither weeps for him nor wraps his cloak about him, but goes his way unconcerned to the gymnasium and the bath. ἀλλά cannot be right. Read a colon after ψυχάν. The asyndeton shows that what follows is the effect of the apathy described in οὐδ' ἐλυνγ. τ. ψυχάν. For ἀλλά read οὐδέ, and the imperfect ἐμίαινε. It is the idiomatic use of οὐ and the imperfect 'he refused to—wasn't going to—defile all his youthful garments upon a corpse.' The corruption was perhaps due to the unusual δέ (55) instead of ἀλλά after the negative. It is at any rate clear from

the corrupt ἄθλω that the passage was not understood.

58 ff. καὶ ποτὶ τὸν θεὸν ἦλθε τὸν ὕβρισε·
λαϊνέας δὲ
ἵστατ' ἀπὸ κρηπίδος ἐς ὕδατα· τῶι δ'
ἐφύπερθεν
ἄλατο καὶ τῶγαλμα, κακὸν δ' ἔκτεινεν
ἐφάβον.

As Cholmeley sees, ἵστατ' requires no change; ἵπατ' would make ἄλατο an anticlimax. But we should surely read

λαϊνέος. It is of no importance to the story that the κρηπίς should be of stone, but that the God of the previous sentence should be present 'in stone' is vital; and the emphatic position shows that the adjective is no mere epithet. Cf. *Ap. Plan.* 146.

Ξεῖνοι, λαϊνέας μὴ ψαύετε τῆς Ἀριάδνης
μὴ καὶ ἀναθρώσκει Θεσεία διζομένη.

J. M. EDMONDS.

ARISTOTLE'S *POETICS*, CH. VIII., 1451^a 22 sqq.; AND CH. I., 1447^b 13-16.

1451^a 22: Ὀδύσειαν γὰρ ποιῶν (ὁ Ὀμηρος) οὐκ ἐποίησεν ὅσα αὐτῷ συνέβη, οἷον πληγῆναι μὲν ἐν τῷ Παρνασσῷ μανῆναι δὲ προσποιήσασθαι ἐν τῷ ἄγερμῳ κ.τ.λ.

About twelve years ago I published an article on this passage in *Class. Rev.*, XV. 3, 1901, and I was encouraged to think, on high authority, that I had done a service by finding the key to what had been a standing puzzle. As the interpretation given of the grammatical construction, then quite new, has come apparently to be taken for granted, it is not presuming to think it was a real service, nor is it unreasonable to wish the origin of it had not been so entirely forgotten. My attention was first drawn to the difficulties usually made about the passage by a debate in the Oxford Philological Society, in which the protagonists were the late Provost of Oriel (Mr. D. B. Monro), Mr. Bywater, and Mr. J. A. Smith. I did not venture to take any part in the discussion, being no expert in the *Poetics*. No satisfactory result was arrived at. On after reflection it seemed to me that on the ordinary construction of the words, with οὐκ ἐποίησεν to govern the infinitives, which seemed to have always been taken for granted, the logical difficulties must remain wholly insuperable—a matter I have explained in the aforesaid article. It struck me it was a mere matter of construing after all: that συνέβη and not οὐκ ἐποίησεν should be understood with πληγῆναι, etc. (οἷον συνέβη αὐτῷ πληγῆναι κ.τ.λ.), and that there was no logical difficulty whatever. It did not

occur to anyone in the debate to take the words thus, nor could I find on investigation that the idea had occurred to any of the older or any of the modern commentators. I communicated my view to Mr. D. B. Monro, and understood from him that he thought it solved the problem. Thereupon I sent it to Dr. Postgate, who admitted it to the *Classical Review*. Professor S. H. Butcher (who did not see my article till two years after its publication, and therefore not till after his own last edition) expressed warm approval of it in a letter to me, and said that the idea of joining συνέβη with πληγῆναι, etc., caused all the difficulties to disappear. The same opinion was expressed to me almost in the same language by another Cambridge scholar. I quote this to show how it was recognised that the essential point was the proposal to construe συνέβη with πληγῆναι, etc., and that it was this which removed the standing difficulties: to show also that the idea was really new, for Professor Butcher, I need not say, could scarcely have failed to know of it if it had been in existence. As I have said, it was certainly unknown to the distinguished Oxford scholars who took part in the debate referred to.

I was surprised to find lately that the translation, which I seem to have been the first to publish, has come to be given without any remark about its origin, as if a piece of ordinary knowledge which needed no comment.

On inquiry I have learned from one of our younger classical teachers that

he was acquainted with my way of taking the words, but had no idea that it dated from an article of mine in the *Classical Review*. He was indeed surprised that something so natural had not been suggested before. This I quote because it seems to supply the explanation of what has happened. Some things are so obvious when once pointed out that one easily forgets that one was ever ignorant of them. I suppose that the given construction of the words, once suggested, is so obvious that the older scholars can forget in the space of a dozen years they ever took them otherwise, while the younger scholars, making their first acquaintance with the passage after the new interpretation has become to some extent current, do not suspect that what seems to them so obvious ever wanted pointing out at all.

This way of putting it, however, would not be just to Mr. Bywater. It turns out indeed that he had completely forgotten my view about *συνέβη* and the argument I founded on it. But after the lapse of some years, when revising his material for the last time before publication, he independently came to the same view himself, at least about *συνέβη*, through realising the difficulty in the word *οὐδέν* in 1451^a 27.

In my previous article in the *Classical Review* I have endeavoured to deal fully with the traditional logical difficulties made about the place, and to show how, as my friend Professor Butcher said, they entirely disappear if the proposed construction of the words is adopted, and therefore I need say no more about it here.

I may take this opportunity to add a suggestion on another passage in the *Poetics*, where also I venture to think a noted problem has a solution which is obvious enough when once pointed out.

The passage (1447^b 20-22) is as follows: *ὁμοίως δὲ κὰν εἴ τις ἅπαντα τὰ μέτρα μιγνύων ποιοῖτο τὴν μίμησιν, καθάπερ Χαιρήμων ἐποίησε Κένταυρον μικτὴν ῥαψωδίαν ἐξ ἁπάντων τῶν μέτρων, καὶ ποιητὴν προσαγορευτέον*. The words *καὶ ποιητὴν προσαγορευτέον* have caused great difficulty, and some of the interpreters have resorted to emendations (for which see Bywater's *Commentary*).

The difficulty seems of long standing to judge from the apograph variant *οὐκ ἤδη καὶ ποιητὴν* for *καὶ ποιητὴν*. *ὁμοίως* has also been found difficult, and unsatisfactory renderings have been given of it. I should maintain that if the argument of the text is understood, it will be seen that the simple and natural translation of the disputed words suits it exactly, and that the text is quite right.

In a preceding part of the text (1447^b 13-16) Aristotle has said that it was the habit to call anyone a poet if he only wrote in metre: his material might be utterly unpoetical, medicine or nature-philosophy, e.g., yet he was to be called a poet (*ποιητὰς . . . προσαγορεύοντες*, cf. *ποιητὴν προσαγορευτέον*), merely because he wrote in metre. So, quite irrespective of his subject-matter, if a man wrote in elegiac metre, he was called an elegiac poet, or, if in the metre of epic, an epic poet. If, then, a man wrote in *a* metre he was called a poet, and of the kind designated by the particular metre.

But now Aristotle had already said further back (1447^b *fin.*) that when the imitation was in metre it might be in one metre or several—*εἴτε μιγνύσα μετ' ἀλλήλων εἴθ' ἐνὶ τινὶ γένει χρωμένη τῶν μέτρων*. Accordingly, he now, in the passage before us, adds to the statement about a man who wrote in one particular metre being called a poet of a kind designated by the metre, merely because he wrote in metre, that on the same principle (*ὁμοίως*), viz. that metre was enough to constitute a poet, if a man wrote in a jumble of all the metres, we should in this case also (*καὶ*) have to give the title poet (*ποιητὴν προσαγορευτέον*). The translation therefore is, 'and similarly' (i.e., on the principle that metre is enough to make a poet), 'also if (*κὰν εἴ*) a man made his imitation in a medley of all metres, like Chæremón's *Centaur*, which was a mixture of all metres, in this case too (*καὶ*) we have to call the man a poet.' (The *καὶ* before *ποιητὴν* seems logically indistinguishable from that before *εἴ*, but the repetition is appropriate after the interposition of the illustration.)

The apograph reading *καὶ τοῦτον ποιητὴν* probably depends on this same

view of the meaning. The insertion of *τοῦτον*, however, is not necessary. It is only the difference between saying 'we must call him a poet too' and 'in this case, too, we must give the title poet.'

Thus the Greek has its plain and natural interpretation. This view could hardly fail to have been taken by the commentators if the passage in dispute had followed directly after 1447^b 13-16, *πλὴν οἱ ἄνθρωποι γε συνάπτοντες τῷ μέτρῳ τὸ ποιεῖν ἐλεγχομένους τοὺς δὲ ἐποποιούς ὀνομάζουσιν, οὐχ ὥς κατὰ τὴν μέμνησιν ποιητὰς ἄλλα κοινῇ κατὰ τὸ μέτρον προσαγορεύοντες*, and they have probably been put off the scent by the interposition of the passage about the

unpoetical character of certain material that happened to be put into metre.

The idea of what Aristotle really intended is not new; indeed, it must be as old as the apograph reading, and one modern translation has it, that of Professor Butcher, but I do not know that anyone has held that it could be got out of the most authoritative form of the text, that without *τοῦτον*. Professor Butcher follows the apograph insertion of *τοῦτον*, and translates: 'So too if a writer should in his poetic imitation combine every variety of metre like Chaeremon . . . we must, according to usage, call him simply a poet.'

J. COOK WILSON.

Oxford.

A ROMAN IMPERIAL DOMAIN.

IN 1910 Sir W. M. Ramsay and I made some excavations at Iconium, which I have described in the *Revue de Philologie*, 1912, p. 48 ff. One of the inscriptions found by us (No. 47) was a dedication to the *Μήτηρ Κουαδάτρηνη*, the mother-goddess of Quadatra, a place which I conjecturally identified with the corrupt *Οὐάδατα*, which Ptolemy places in Cappadocia.¹ An inscription copied by us at Laodiceia Combusta in 1911 invests the ethnic applied to the mother-goddess in the Iconian inscription with considerable interest for students of the history of the Roman Imperial Estates in Asia Minor.

In a mountain-valley between Iconium and Laodiceia Combusta (but nearer the latter), with fertile tilth, rich cinnabar mines, and a cool and bracing climate in summer, there lies a Turkish village called Sizma. This village is close to an ancient mound, which marks the site of an old Anatolian village, whose name was Zizima. The name is not found in any ancient record, but it is implied in the adjective *Ζιζιμηνή* or

Ζιζιμηνή, applied to the mother-goddess of this valley, and it clearly survives in the modern name Sizma. To judge by the relatively large number of her cult-inscriptions and representations found in this neighbourhood, the Zizimene Mother was the most important figure in the religion of Iconium, Laodiceia Combusta, and the surrounding districts. She is usually called simply the *Μήτηρ Ζιζιμηνή*, but on an inscription of the Roman *colonia* Iconium we find her called Minerva Zizimene. The name is Latin, but the goddess is the Anatolian mother-goddess, who was worshipped under different names in different parts of Asia Minor.

It has been known since 1888, when Ramsay published some Laodicean inscriptions mentioning slaves or freedmen of the Roman Emperors,² that there was Imperial property in the vicinity of Laodiceia Combusta. Since then a systematic search of the whole neighbourhood has gradually brought to light a mass of evidence bearing on the character and situation of the Imperial Estates in this corner of Phrygia. In 1905 Professor Ramsay published all that was then known about the Imperial property of Zizima in the *Classical Review*, p. 367 ff. He referred to seven dedications to the

¹ This suggestion gathers strength from the form *Οὐάδατα*, given by one of the MSS. This accentuation is easily explained by the accent of *Quadrata*. *Quadrata* (see below) was not in Cappadocia, but as Cappadocia consisted largely of Imperial Estates, a Lycaonian estate might readily be assigned to it by the inaccurate Ptolemy.

² *Ath. Mitth.* 1888 (xiii.), p. 242 f.

Zizimene Mother (to which I have added two in the above-mentioned paper in the *Revue de Philologie*), and to eleven inscriptions containing certain or probable references to slaves or freedmen of the Emperors, one of which was found at Zizima, and is of a type regularly found on Imperial Estates. A revised copy of this inscription was published by Miss Ramsay in her (privately printed) *Preliminary Report to the Wilson Trustees* (Aberdeen, 1909), and I was permitted to add a few notes on it, after re-examination of the stone, in *J. H. S.*, 1911, p. 196. The inscription mentions an *οικονόμος* of one of the Emperors, who made a dedication to Jehovah Dionysus on behalf of his master and of a village on the estate.

In 1911 Laodiceia Combusta gave us five fresh inscriptions mentioning Imperial slaves or freedmen, to which, with one exception, I need only refer here. This exception runs as follows: (R. & C. 1911.)

VLIAEWAMEAP
TISSIMAEAVG
FAEMATRIDOM
NOSTRI SEVEP
XANDRIPIIFELI
GVSTIETCAST
GLYCERINVS LIB
PRAEDIORVMQVADRAT
RVMGRATIASAGENS NVMINI MAIES
TATIOVEEIVS LIBENS POSYI

J]uliae [M]ameae [e san-
c]tissimae Aug[us-
tae matri dom]ini
nostri Sever[i A-
le]xandri pii feli[cis Au-
gusti et cast[r]orum
Glycerinus lib[ertus]
p[rae]diorum Quadrat-
o[r]um gratias agens numini maies-
tatique eius libens posui.

This inscription dates between 222 and 235 A.D. Glycerinus, the (Imperial) freedman in charge of the *praedia Quadrata* made a dedication to Julia Mamaea, the mother of Severus Alexander and the *mater castrorum*. An Imperial freedman must of course have been in charge of Imperial property; the inscription accordingly gives us the name

of the Imperial Estate near Laodiceia Combusta, to which the numerous Imperial slaves and freedmen mentioned in inscriptions of the city belonged.

Sir W. M. Ramsay, in his article on the 'Tekmoreian Guest-Friends' in *Studies in the E. Rom. Provinces*, p. 305 ff., has laid it down as a principal holding for Asia Minor generally that the lands which we know to have belonged to the temples of the gods in the earlier period came into the private ownership of the Roman Emperors, were managed by their servants, and passed with the *patrimonium* to their successors. We have the evidence of Strabo¹ and of inscriptions² that this was the fate of the estates of Mên Askaënos near Pisidian Antioch. The present inscription, taken together with the Iconian dedication to the *Μήτηρ Κουαδατηννή*, is a complete proof that the history of the divine property at Zizima was similar to that of the estates of the god Mên. The *Μήτηρ Κουαδατηννή* is of course none other than the goddess whose cult dominated the religion of this entire region, the *Μήτηρ Ζυζιμηνή*. Her epithet is formed in this case not from the old Anatolian name of her Estates, but from the name which the Romans gave to her Estates when they took them over. *Κουαδατηννή* is obviously metathesis of *Κουαδρατηννή*,³ an ethnic formed with the commonest Anatolian suffix from *Κουαδράτα*, Latin *Quadrata*. *Κουαδρατηννή* replaces *Ζυζιμηνή* as the epithet of the goddess, just as the Roman Emperors had supplanted the goddess herself and her priests in the ownership of the Estates. The name *Quadrata* probably refers to the mineral wealth in which the valley of Zizima abounded; the term is apparently not found elsewhere in this sense, but the sense follows naturally (as Sir W. M. Ramsay points out to me) from such expressions as *saxum quadratum*, *opus quadratarium*, and *quadratarius*. Or possibly the Estate had

¹ p. 577.

² *Tekmoreian Guest-Friends*, *op. cit.*

³ My understanding of those inscriptions began with a suggestion from Professor Souter that *Κουαδατηννή* had some connection with the Latin word *quadratus*.

belonged to a man named Quadratus, who bequeathed it to an Emperor, or had it confiscated. I have described the cinnabar mines of Sizma, which are being worked for mercury ore at the present day, in *Klio*, 1910, p. 242, and a description of the skulls of some entombed miners (which I secured through the kindness of Mr. Hugh Whittall) and of some other ancient remains found at the mines has been published by Professor J. L. Myres in the *Annals of Archaeology*, etc., Liverpool, vol. ii., p. 91.

The ethnic *Κυαδρηνός*, implying a place-name *Quadra*, is applied to a

member of the Tekmoreian Association in an inscription copied at Saghir, near Pisidian Antioch, in 1911. This is perhaps a shortened form of *Quadrata*. See *J. H. S.*, 1912, p. 170. A man living on the Imperial Estate at Zizima would naturally belong to the Antiochian Association, for the Domain at Antioch was the religious and probably also the administrative centre of a large number of Imperial Estates in Asia and Galatia at the end of the third century after Christ.

W. M. CALDER.

Brasenose College, Oxford.

CORRIGENDA ET ADDENDA.

(I) THE EASTERN BOUNDARY OF THE PROVINCE ASIA.

IN the *Classical Review*, 1908, p. 213, I published an inscription of Chekirji, near the boundary of Galatia and Lycaonia, which I interpreted as containing a date by the name of a proconsul of Asia, D. Caelius Calvinus Balbinus, and as therefore proving that the eastern boundary of the province Asia extended as far east as Chekirji. This inscription has been revisited by Sir W. M. Ramsay and myself, and should read as follows:

ΚΛΕΥΠΑΤΡ ΑΚΑΙΔΙΟ

ΗΔΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΙΛΙΑΝ

ΚΑΥΡΝΙΚ Α ΝΔΡΟΣ

ΔΑΔΕΥΣ ΚΤΑΤΑΣ

ΑΛΕΞΑ ΝΔΡΟΣ

ΗΜΩΝ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΓΛΥΚΙΣ

ΤΑΤΩ ΑΝΕΥΑΝΕ

ΜΝ ΜΗ

ΧΑ

Κλ. Εὐπάτρα καὶ Διο-

μῆδος καὶ Αἰλιαν-

ος καὶ Αὐρ. Νικάνδρος

καὶ Δάδης καὶ Τάτας

5 καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος

τῶν ἡμῶν πατρ[ὸς] γλυκι-

τάτῳ [Μ]άν[ο]ν ἀνε-

στήσαμεν μνη[σ]

χαρίν.

My 1908 copy was made in a bad light, and I depended for the epigraphic copy published in the *Classical Review* mainly on an impression. The impression caught enough of line 1 to suggest as certain the transcription which I offered, and no more. The new copy was made in a better light, and has freed the ancient topography of this region from what proved on further study to be an embarrassing error. I apologise to any writer on this subject whom my former publication may have led astray.

The first name in this inscription may represent the local pronunciation of Κλεοπάτρα; but as Εὐπάτρα is found on inscriptions of the same district, it is more probable that the name is Κλ(αυδία) Εὐπάτρα. The use of the quasi-praenomen Aurelius in line 3 marks the inscription as later than A.D. 212.¹ Claudia Eupatra is probably the descendant of a freedman of Claudius²; there were extensive Imperial estates in Northern Lycaonia, and several names found in inscriptions on those estates can only have belonged to the families of Imperial freedmen. I hope soon to publish a collection of over 200 inscriptions from those Estates.

¹ See Ramsay in *Classical Review*, 1905, p. 369.

² The name occurs also at Iconium. See Wiegand in *Ath. Mitth.*, 1905, p. 324 f., and my paper in the *Revue de Philologie*, 1912.

(2) Ἱππεύς = *Equiso*.

I have noted two further instances of the use of Ἱππεύς = *equiso* pointed out in the *Classical Review*, 1910, p. 11 ff. The first is in an inscription of Oinan (near Lysias), published by Mr. Anderson in J H S, 1898, p. 108, No. 46, and re-copied by me in 1911. This inscription runs Ἀ]μον Καίσαρος δούλ[η] τὸ ἥρῶν Διαδουμένῳ τῷ ἰδίῳ ἀνδρὶ Καίσαρος δούλ[ω] Ἱππ[εῖ]. . . . In 1911 I could distinguish the top of the last I of ΠΠΕΙ, as well as the middle bar of E. This inscription is carved on an altar, with a defaced relief between lines 1 and 2; on the right side, there is a round shield and two spears. But this ornamentation, being very common in and near Pisidia, cannot be taken as showing that an Imperial slave was a horse-soldier. Oinan lay on or near an Imperial estate on the Great Eastern Highway; this inscription belongs to the Estates.

The second instance occurs in an inscription copied by Sir W. M. Ramsay at Laodiceia Combusta in 1911. He kindly allows me to publish it here. It is a cut on a *stele* with pointed pediment, containing two human figures and a basket.

ΑΓΡΙΠΠΕΙΝΑΚΥ
ΡΙΟΥΚΑΙΣΑΡΟΣ
ΔΟΥΛΗΑΠΡΕΙΛΙΩ
ΙΠΠΕΙΚΑΙ ΚΟΣΜΙ
ΑΓΩΝΕΥΣΙΓΛΥΚΥ
ΤΑΤΟΙΣΜΝΗΚΗΣ
ΧΑΡΙΝΚΑΙΕΑΥΤΗΖΩ
CA

Ἀγριππείνα κυ-
ρίον Καίσαρος
δούλη Ἀπρειλίῳ
Ἱππεί καὶ Κοσμί-
ῳ γονεῦσι γλυκυ-
τάτοις μνήμης
χάριν καὶ ἑαυτῇ ζῶ-
σα.

Aprilius, like the two οὔρναι (Σεβασ-
τοῦ) of Laodiceia referred to in my former
paper, was in charge of the Imperial
horses stabled at Laodiceia in con-
nection with the *cursus publicus* along
the Eastern Highway, and the transport
work on the Imperial Estates of Zizima.

In 1910 I was able to read more of
the inscription published from Sir
W. M. Ramsay's copy in *Classical Review*,
1910, p. 12.¹ It is cut on a small *stele*,
broken at the top, and runs as follows:

ΖΕΡΝΑΙΠΤΕΥΕ
ΖΟΗΤΡΟΦΩ
ΤΕΚΝΩΚΑΙΙΔΙ
ΑΜΗΜΕ ΕΝΕ
ΚΕΝΤΗΓΥΝΟΙ
ΔΑΙΚΕΑΥΤΩ

[ὁ δεῖνα]
οὔρνα Ἱππεὺς
Ζοητρόφῳ
τέκνῳ καὶ ἰδί-
ῳ μνήμης ἐνε-
κεν τῇ γυν(αικῇ) Οἰ-
δαί κ[ε] ἑαυτῷ.

Zoetrophos is accordingly the name
of the child, as Ramsay's copy indicated.
The syntax of the last four lines is in-
volved; ἰδίᾳ should stand between τῇ
and γυν(αικῇ). Words of relationship
are sometimes written in abbreviation,
e.g. ΜΗ for ΜΗΤΡΙ in *Studies in the*
E. Rom. Provinces (Ramsay), p. 175,
No. 67 (revised by Ramsay and me in
1910, when we noted that the inscription
is complete). The name Οἶδα occurs
in Sterrett *Wolfe Expedition*, No. 535,
and on an unpublished inscription of
Laodiceia Combusta. The *iota ad-*
scriptum occurs here and there in in-
scriptions of the Imperial period: see
Classical Review, 1910, p. 78. In
Ἱππεύς ΠΠΕ are in ligature.

W. M. CALDER.

¹ Cf. *Ath. Mitth.*, 1888, p. 242, No. 22.

MARONES: VIRGIL AS PRIEST OF APOLLO.

IN spite of a certain variability of climate, Thrace must have been a more or less attractive place of habitation in the long long ago, under the lordship of Ares, Apollo, and Dionysus, before Apollo migrated south to Delphi, the Muses to Parnassus, the Maenads to Citheron. Who would not have hunted with the Edonian hounds? raced the West Wind with Harpalyce? or shot with her sporting sisters, all in their simple sylvan suits? Who would not have tilted and taken tea with the northern prototype of Volscian Camilla? in the far-off days of freedom and equality of the sexes, before the country, once the teeming home of modern movements, sank to be the nursing mother of copper-headed slaves: when from the bank of Hebrus blood-red Ares thundered on his shield, and shook his chariot reins for war; and in many-coloured panoply fair Amazons responded with drum-beats from the banks of Thermodon: hard-hearted, single-breasted—single-breasted perhaps, but not, according to their own national philosophy, hard-hearted, nay, rather a merciful sisterhood, a loving body of good women bent on good works, in a land where every infant born into this world of sin and sorrow was greeted with howls of lamentation: every soul departing was sped on its way to a better world with wild demonstrations of gladness, and jubilant ululation. To help in this kindly task of speeding the parting guest may well have been up-to-date charity, benevolence, philanthropy. Philanthropic, too, may have been the purpose of the concerts and musical competitions, such as that to which Thamyras challenged the Muses, who, in their indignation, silenced his singing by a stroke, and made him forget his playing. Benevolent certainly the banquets of Zalmoxis, who used to entertain the local aristocracy of non-thinkers at dinner to discuss questions of immortality and a future life. A land of philosophers and poets, of literary societies, and religious revivals, where dwelt in a kind of holy freemasonry men initiated into never yet revealed mysteries, aiming at purification of the

soul from sin and the body from passion through strict vegetarian diet; where, moreover, venerable priests could grow famous, like the Carthusian or Benedictine monks in more recent centuries, for the strength and quality of their liqueurs; and a single Temperance king, armed with a stock-whip, could exclude for a time the introduction of alcohol into his kingdom, and drive back the wine god to his unlicensed cradle; but not for ever: back came the god and back came his following of Maenads, breaking the windows of heaven with wild cries, and in their blind husband-hunger lynching the forlorn widower for his inconsiderate inconsolability. A glorious age, when the goodly company of Edonian wine-drinkers could get a warning manifesto pointing to the blinded eyes and shortened life of their anti-alcoholic adversary, King Lycurgus of the stock-whip, into a monthly serial then being brought out by Homer (*Iliad*, No. 6, 30); and the Thracian wine-growers' association could follow it up with an advertisement in a later serial by the same author booming the sweet, dark wine of Ismarus. Here it is (*Od.* 9, 196-211): 'I went on my way and took with me a goat-skin of sweet, dark wine, which was given me by Maron, son of Euanthes, priest of Apollo, Protector of Ismarus, because we had saved him with his wife and child in reverence, for he dwelt within the leafy grove of Phoebus Apollo. So he made me splendid presents: seven talents of fine gold, and a mixing-bowl of solid silver, and moreover twelve jars of wine, drawn fresh from the cask, sweet, unblended, a drink for gods: nor did any of the servants or attendants in the house know of it, only himself, and wife, and house-keeper; and whenever he drank that honey-sweet, red wine, he filled a liqueur glass, and poured it into twenty measures of water; and so sweet an aroma of fragrance indescribable arose from the mixing-bowl that in very truth it was not easy to refrain.' The words

Βῆν· ἀτὰρ αἴγειον ἄσκον ἔχον μέλανος οἶνουιο,

Ἡδέος, ὃν μοι ἔδωκε Μάρων Εὐάνθεος
 υἱός,
 Ἴρεὺς Ἀπόλλωνος ὃς Ἴσμαρον ἀμφιβέ-
 βήκει,

(*Od.* 9, 196-199) form the text of this homily.

It would be natural that Virgil, when in the course of his reading Homer he first came across the passage just quoted, giving the name and address of Maron, son of Euanthes (Flower-bloom), who supplied that famous Ciconian wine to Odysseus, which made the Cyclops sleep so soundly before his loud awakening, should have been struck with a certain familiar ring, as if he had heard something like it before—not only in Maron, his own name, but the ‘son of Flower-bloom’ may have recalled to him his own father’s forest garden, and bee-keeping, and honey so essential to the making of wine in those pre-sugary days. It would also be natural that he should feel drawn to the country of his possible ancestors, and find in imagination a sort of kinship with the great names of old, a kind of family pride in his remote Thracian connections.

Nor is it strange that from the first, even in the Eclogues, we find this glowing sympathy for the cradle-land of his race, and legendary home. *E.* 6, 36, He says: ‘Nor did Rhodope and Ismarus admire Orpheus so much’ (*Nec tantum Rhodope mirantur et Ismarus Orphea*). So in *E.* 4, 55:

Nor me should Thracian Orpheus vanquish then,
 Nor Linus glad in mother or in sire;
 No, nor Apollo strike more sweet for men
 The glory of his lyre.

F. W. H. M.

Non me carminibus vincet nec Thracius
 Orpheus
 Nec Linus; huic mater quamvis atque huic
 pater adsit,
 Orphei Calliopea, Lino formosus Apollo.

Or that Tereus, Procne, Philomela, unhappy movers in that high company, should be the early recipients of his wondrous pity:

E. 6, 78-81.

Aut ut mutatos Terei narraverit artus,
 Quas illi Philomela dapes, quae dona pararit,
 Quo cursu deserta petiverit, et quibus ante
 Infelix sua tecta supervolaverit alis?

Nor is there anything strange in his wild joy at the thought of rearranging his ancestral Ismarian mountain-sides with the glory of the vine (*G.* 2, 37, *Juvat Ismara Baccho conserere*), or in his wistful yearning to be transported in his summer holiday to the distant land of his forefathers. ‘Oh! for one,’ he cries, ‘to take and set me in the cool valleys of Haemus, and roof me in with a huge canopy of over-arching branches’ (*G.* 2, 487, 0, *qui me gelidis in vallibus Haemi | Sistat, et ingenti ramorum protegat umbra!*) No thought of aviation in his heart: for the pioneer daring of Icarus he was even then hoarding pent up matchless tears (*A.* 6, 30-33):

Tu quoque magnam
 Partem opere in tanto, sineret dolor, Icare,
 haberes.
 Bis conatus erat casus effingere in auro;
 Bis patriae cecidere manus.

Nor yet would it be strange if in his fancy the old Maronian house of Thrace should ever seem to be calling, calling to the new Maronian house in Mantua, with a cry Ismarian:

Κίκονες Κικόνεσσι γηγόνευν, *Od.* 9, 47.

Send but a song over sea for us,
 Heart of their hearts who are free;
 Heart of their singers to be for us
 More than our singers can be.

For the songs of Thamyris and Musaeus had long been floating in the wide, unharvested universe beyond the ear-shot of man, and the genuine fragments of Orpheus’s poems had, like his limbs, already been scattered and lost. And what a song did he send! Where is the like of it? Take any part of the tale of Orpheus and Eurydice at haphazard, even in borrowed paraphrase:

G. 4, 507-527.

Ah, wedded twice, twice widowed of his love,
 What should he do, and whither should he
 go?

And with what music hope to move
 Divinities below?

For seven long months in unilluminated caves,
 Taming fierce beasts, and leading oaks
 along,

He sat by Strymon’s solitary waves,
 And wept his soul in song.

With such a grief for her lost brood forlorn
 Laments all night the piteous nightingale,
 And pours herself from even unto morn
 In one melodious wail.

i. In *Eclogues*, *Georgics*, and the prophetic parts of the *Aeneid*, Virgil was steadily engaged in raising Augustus, the earthly Apollo, to heaven, or bringing down the heavenly Apollo to earth. His the altar which many a tender lamb from the Maronian sheep-folds will dye with purple (*E.* i, 6-8): his the altar too where annual offerings of foaming milk rich with olive oil, and bottled nectar were to be set (*E.* 5, 65-71). He, or his, the child being born addressed in *E.* 4, 49 as 'dear progeny of gods; mighty incarnation of Jove,' a line which cancels at a stroke all other candidates for the honour of being the Great Unknown—for none, except Augustus himself or his son (if any), had the required descent from Jove (et mi genus ab Jove summo (of Aeneas). The fourth Eclogue must therefore have been either a birthday poem to his never-born son, or a retrospective birthday poem—'a 'twenty-firster'—greeting to Augustus himself celebrating his being born or born again as Apollo, son of Jove, written like other prophecies after the event, and (according to the Rev. Mr. Smith, S.J., of Stonyhurst, in the *Month*, January, 1870), this would be astrologically correct. Augustus too

is the mortal invoked at length in *G. 1*, whose place in heaven is still unassigned (Oh! the difficulties and inconvenience of two Apollos!) (*G. 1*, 24-32), though Virgil does suggest a certain vacancy in the sky for Augustus, a certain polite withdrawal of over-crowding constellations, somewhat in the language of Shelley to Keats:

It was for thee yon kingless sphere has long
Swung blind in unascended majesty,
Silent alone amid an Heaven of Song.
Assume thy winged throne, thou Vesper of
our throng!

Plainest of all at the beginning of the third Georgic, after invoking Phoebus under the title of his former residence on earth as shepherd to Admetus (Pastor ab Amphyryo), Virgil openly proclaims his priesthood to the living Augustus, and declares his intention of building him a temple on the banks of the Mincius (a temple never made with hands), and although he subsequently varied this first vision of the Aeneid, he never changed or faltered in his sacerdotal deifying purpose. To the temple of Augustus (as the new Apollo) he was to be the first to conduct the Muses from Parnassus: the first to bring in subjection the vanquished Hebrew prophets from Edom. In the centre of all will be his Caesar, and will fill the temple with his presence. Maro will be his priest, and himself, crowned with olive and arrayed in purple, will do high sacrifice. Himself design gold and ivory carvings for the doors, commemorative of Augustan victories, and set up breathing marble statues for the branch house of Assaracus, and names handed down from Jove (*G. 3*, 35, *demissaeque ab Jove gentis | Nomina, Trosque parens, et Trojae Cynthius auctor.*); and so we get back from Augustus Apollo to the Homeric god at the other end of the chain—to Phoebus Apollo of Ismarus and Troy.

The Aeneid, being the temple in which Augustus Apollo is to dwell, Virgil proceeds indefatigably with his sacerdotal programme in such parts of the poem as can be carried on by prophecy. For, since Augustus was not to be born for several hundred years, it was impossible to proceed otherwise than by foretelling the future.

In *A. 1*, 286 Jupiter promises Venus that a Caesar shall be born of Troy's illustrious line, whose empire shall be bounded only by ocean, whose glory by the stars—Julius, a name descending from great Iulus, whom fearless of opposition she would one day welcome to heaven laden with the spoils of the East... he too shall be invoked in prayer. So in *A. 6*, 792, 'This is the man you have heard so often promised you: Augustus Caesar of race divine.' And again in *l. 799 et seq.*:

Lo! at his coming is vague terror shed
From hideous oracles and homes of guile.
Lo! at his coming roar with nameless dread
The myriad mouths of Nile.

Not Alexander led his hosts so far
Across the earth, a never travelled way,
Beyond strange streams, and o'er astonished
coasts,
Bound for the break of day.

Nor drive so far the victor youth divine
The linked tigers of his leafy car;
Nor did the robber of the royal kine
His course extend so far.

Albeit he caught the brazen-footed deer,
And laid the curse of Erymanthus low,
And shook at Lerna o'er the affrighted mere
The terror of his bow.

F. W. H. M. (*with the
alteration of a word*).

A hymn of exultant salutation from the hereditary Ismarian priest of Apollo at the thought of the coming reincarnation of his god, suggesting like the fourth Eclogue the burning blood of the Hebrew prophets of old racing through Maronian veins, and revealing a veritable spiritual affinity, recognised long after by the Early Church, between the prophet-poet of Apollo and the prophet-poets of the Holy Land. Incarnation was in the air.

Lastly, take the picture in Book 8, 678, of Augustus leading united Italy to battle at Actium, surrounded by senate, people, penates, and great gods (as it were an ark of the covenant), 'standing high on his lofty deck'—'his joyous temples shooting forth twin flames, and his paternal star manifest above his head.' Attributes of divinity.

Hinc Augustus agens Italos in proelia Caesar
Cum patribus, populoque, penatibus et magnis
dis,
Stans celsa in puppi: geminas cui tempora
flammas
Laeta vomunt, patriumque aperitur vertice sidus.

And again l. 704:

'On beholding this (state of the battle)
Actian Apollo bent his bow from on
high, and every dusky took to flight'
(Oh, for one twang of Apollo's bow
now! Oh, for a return of the white
glory of our streets!)

Actius haec cernens arcum intendebat Apollo
Desuper: omnis eo terrore Aegyptus et Indi
Omnis Arabs omnes vertebant terga Sabaei.

Whether 'desuper' means from on high in heaven or on Actian rock temple, or on lofty ship deck (stans celsa in puppi), the words seem to refer not only to Phoebus, but to the living Augustus, identified here with him as one and the same, the old great god of Troy, and the new Actian Apollo of imperial Rome, who, in l. 720, takes his seat in the snowy temple of gleaming Phoebus, and reviews the offerings of all nations:

Ipsae sedens niveo candentis limine Phoebi
Dona recognoscit populorum.

So much concerning Virgil's sacerdotal adoration of Augustus Apollo in the *Eclogues*, *Georgics*, and *Aeneid*.

II. It remains to show briefly how he was also engaged in doing continuous honour to the original god of Troy, the god of prophecy, quite apart from ordinary invocations, such as *G.* 4, 4:

si quem

Numina laeva sinunt, auditque vocatus Apollo,

and from daily ministrations as a poet to Apollo as god of Song, and to the Muses who were of Apollo's train and company, and are specified in *G.* 3, as about to be escorted by his priest Virgil from Parnassus to the temple of the new Apollo at Mantua, and are also invoked by him in his famous prayer, *G.* 2, 247: 'Me first and above all may the sweet Muses, whose mysteries I carry, smit with boundless love, take to themselves and instruct in the paths of the sky and the stars.' Quite apart from such poet's worship and prayer, such poet's privilege as loving acolyte, of carrying joyfully the sacred music of the Muses, there may be seen running through the *Aeneid* Virgil's persistent devotion to Phoebus

Apollo, the great god of Troy and of prophecy. In truth the *Aeneid* is, as Virgil had dreamed, *G.* 3, 13, a marble temple for the god and himself as priest, founded, constructed, and dedicated to the setting forth of the glory of the Homeric god from the fall of Troy to his reappearance on earth in the person of Augustus Caesar.

After the piteous death of Pantheus Othryades, priest of Apollo's temple on the Ilion citadel (arcis templique sacerdos), the keeping of the great gods and penates devolved on Aeneas, now head and representative of the royal family of Troy, and the poet chronicler had to take upon himself the function of prophet and priest, and to become perpetual preacher of the Apollinarian purpose in guiding Aeneas from Ilion downfallen to Rome arising: from the hour of the departure of the exile to the consummation of victory at Actium, marked, as has been seen, at both ends by the conspicuous presence of penates and great gods (the ark of the covenant). He makes Aeneas voyage first to Thrace, a country from of old friendly, and bound to Troy by family ties and kindred gods; then to Delos, where Anius, the Delian king and priest of Phoebus, bids the Trojans seek their 'ancient mother'—mistaken by Anchises for Crete; after that, to save the voyagers from returning to the oracle for a clearer response, the great gods themselves appeared in a vision to put things right, and to tell Aeneas what Apollo, if reconsulted at Delos, would have said, namely that the Trojans were to go to Corythus, and seek Ausonian land (*A.* 3, 154-170). This interposition is all the more psychically appropriate if it be supposed that among the images of the great gods on board the Tencrian flag-ship was (perhaps in the state cabin) one of Apollo. Next Aeneas is landed in Chaonia, and directed to King Helenus, another minister and mouthpiece of Apollo, who promised him that the Fates would find them a way out of all their difficulties, and Apollo be present in answer to their prayers. He further charges Aeneas to visit in person the Sibyl at Cumae, and not to be content with the fluttering leaves of her written MSS., needing an expert in paleography to rearrange and decipher them, but to

demand the living word from the very lips of the prophetess, and mouthpiece not only of Apollo, but also of his goddess sister, Lady of the Land of Shadows (*Triviae Phoebique sacerdos*). Deiphobe, the Sibyl, after advising him how he might get a foothold in Italy, personally conducts him through the sights of the underworld, the dim-lit ghost land of departed heroes, and the sun-lit happy green valley of heroes unincarnate, waiting to be born. A magnificent panoramic rehearsal of Roman history to be from Iulus to Augustus. (What a chance for a cinematographer of to-day to reproduce it all!)

Thus was Aeneas passed on from priest to priest, and prophet to prophet of Apollo, from Anius to the great gods and Helenus, from Helenus to Deiphobe; but behind all, behind Anius, Helenus, Deiphobe was the hereditary hierophant Maro carrying on his life worship of the god of his fathers. In his careful description of the ecstatic frenzy and inspiration of the Sibyl, of the inner workings, the possession and control of the god over his priestess, he seems to catch the very wind of the spirit, and draw close to the very edge of the mystery of things known to priests only, and those the haunTERS of the inmost sanctuary of that voiceful cavern.

In such a manner did Maro fulfil the functions of his hereditary Ismarian priesthood continuously from his early youth—the days of his reading Homer—till that latest hour when he too reached the larger air and purpler glow of his own Elysian fields, and entered unchallenged on his well-earned rest, ushered in by high-towering, stately Musaeus, to the processional music of Orpheus robed in flowing sacramental lawn, and to the tumultuous choral anthem of his own happy, happy forefathers (Maron, son of Euanthes, one), that he might take his place among 'priests holy all their lives, and poets true to their god, whose singing had been worthy of Phoebus' whether in the flesh or out of the flesh, Phoebus Apollo or Phoebus Augustus, for which his earthly career had been one life-long preparation. *Ἰρενς Ἀπόλλωνος ὅς Ἰσμαρον ἀμφιβεβήκει.*

A. 6, 661-2.

*Quique sacerdotes casti, dum vita manebat,
Quique pii vates, et Phoebos digna locuti.*

It may be objected to the view here propounded that it is so elementary and obvious, so simple and true as not to be worth mentioning. There is no answer to this. Or it may be contended that it is so fanciful, fantastic, and extravagant that no one can be expected to believe it. Against this contention it may be pleaded in the words of the highest and latest authority 'that the history of the past can be understood by no man who cannot transport himself into the souls of men passed away.' 'We ourselves, when once Dryasdust has done his work within us, and we can advance to the shaping of our scientific results, from that time forth we use our own free formative imagination.' 'Tradition is dead: our task is to revivify the life that has passed away.' 'In science is no defeat if only the truth is handed on still burning to successors' (von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf).

If then in that age, one so great and sane as Julius Caesar, in the prime of his manhood and quaestorship, could publicly declare in a funeral oration, 'My aunt Julia derived her descent on her mother's side from a race of kings, and on her father's side from the immortal gods. For the Marcii Reges, her mother's family, deduce their pedigree from Ancus Marcius, and the Julii, her father's family, from Venus, of which stock we are a branch. We therefore unite in our descent the majesty of kings, chiefest among men, and the divine majesty of the gods, to whom kings themselves are subject;' and if in that age Octavianus could personate Apollo resident on earth at a fancy dress dinner-party, and solemnly order his own statue to be executed wearing the emblems in full of that deity, can it be regarded as altogether fanciful, fantastic, extravagant, and incredible that Virgil, who was his Poet-Laureate, devoting all his genius to the promotion of these aspirations, and engaged in consecrating and magnifying the majesty of the head of the state, should have dared to conceive of himself, be it seriously or half-seriously, or piously, mystically,

Orphically as the Hereditary High Priest and Prophet or the Hereditary Grand-Chaplain Extraordinary of the new god and of the old—an office suggested partly by the living presence, heavenly promise, and dazzling beauty of the young Augustus, hiddenly claiming to be Apollo, on earth, before whose effulgent gaze all other eyes should drop; and partly by a brooding contemplation of his own Maronian name, for ever in literature indissociable from the worship of Phoebus Apollo, Protector of Ismarus? To pass over other notable instances of parallel name-stimulus, and momentous name-consequences, when Junius Brutus Wilkes Booth turned his mind to the assassination of President Lincoln, was not the true murderer, the true theatrical high uplifter of the dripping red dagger, the true stage declaimer of the words 'sic semper tyrannis,' his god-father or god-mother in his baptism? Here was not Homer the true god-father and consecrator of Virgil's life to the priesthood of Apollo? Homer the true prime begetter of the glorious advent hymn of incarnation (*E.* 4)? Homer the true founder of the marble temple in the green Mincian plain where Virgil publicly took upon himself holy orders, and assumed the Maronian pontifical purple in succession to the son of Euanthes?

G. 3, 17.

Illic victor ego et Tyrio conspectus in ostro.

Let then the Maronian flag wave henceforth in undisputed mastery, not over Mantua only as heretofore, but over the vine-clad heights of Ismarus, and far away to the Rhodopeian North Pole:

G. 3, 351.

Quaque redit medium Rhodope porrecta sub axem.

It is not here pretended that the dreams and life-long imagining of Virgil about his possible pedigree corresponded closely with facts, or were more than a fond and enduring conjecture of what might have been. He has himself supplied us incidentally with the mode and manner in which he conceived that the house of Ismarus

reached Italy. There seem to have been two branches: one still in Thrace, and the other settled in Maonia, and so in Roman mind and poetry directly associated with Homer (a possible relation). Representatives of both branches are described as having entered Latium with Aeneas, and as fighting their way, and presumably settling in mid-Italy, so leaving later gradual migration northwards to Mantua as an open possibility. The passages referred to occur in *A.* 10, 139:

*Te quoque magnanimae viderunt, Ismare, gentes
Vulnera dirigere et calamos armare veneno,
Maonia generose domo;*

and l. 350:

*Tres quoque Threicios Boreae de gente supremæ,
Et tres, quos Idas pater et patria Ismara mittit,
Per varios sternit casus.*

where 'patria' might even be taken for 'my own native land' Ismara. So that the poet himself has given an indication, and left it to posterity to work out and interpret.

In the coming age of strict investigation into heredity, and of scientific study of eugenics, the genuine researcher will refuse to be bound by legendary stories or vague traditions, and will look rather for truth in pure subjectivity, and will prefer to extract the wanderings of Virgil's ancestors from internal evidence and unconscious revelations contained in the poems themselves. Hitherto he has been mainly regarded as a Celt pure and simple, and critics have explained the romantic element in his poetry on that assumption. The scientist of the future will perhaps take a wider and more comprehensive view, and arrive at a provisional hypothesis based upon the complex racial origins of the various tendencies of the poet's own soul, rather than upon defective, fragmentary assertions handed down concerning the past movements of his undiscoverable forefathers. The poet's own far-reaching backward instincts, his vague retrospective longings, Hyperborean or Orientalian, will be allowed to count. The coming master of genetic analysis of individual character will easily discriminate and classify through his binocular of Mendelism and psychology, the separate

contributions of Semitic, Thracian, Greek, Latin, and Celtic races towards the making of the consummate genius of Virgil; and next after the blood of Greeks and Thracians—sometime joint sharers in the production of the historian Thucydides, son of Olorus—will surely attach greater importance to any ascertainable Hebrew strain in Maro, on account of the persistent value and durability of that particular type when once introduced into a family. Here may lurk the solution of a mystery, how, in the *Eclogues*, Virgil caught the very morning glow of the prophets of Israel; and in the four *Georgics* the breath of the land full of corn and wine, and flowing with milk and honey; and in the piety of Aeneas, the coming prayer 'thy will be done.'

If therefore it ever becomes scientifically and eugenistically necessary to provide Virgil with a Jewish ancestor or ancestress, the Thrace-ward round of his own intuitional choosing presents a natural way by which it can be done, although direct voyage from Judea to a north Italian port might seem to us more likely. The omnipresent Phœnicians, the carriers, traders, raiders, pirates, and kidnappers of the Mediterranean, were from the earliest times engaged in mining and wine-growing in Thasos (*G.* 2, 91, *sunt Thasiæ vites*) and on the Ciconian mainland. What could be simpler? A maiden daughter of a prophet in Israel, sweetly slumbering in her father's vineyard, is kidnapped after the manner of the age, and sold to Tyre or Sidon, and, after long years of residence in a luxurious palace, is conveyed in a vessel of her Sidonian merchant-prince to his island home in Thasos, and thence to his Ismarian country-seat on the mainland. A daughter of the house skilled in the culture of the grape, the care of flowers, and the making of liqueurs, marries Maron, son of Euanthes, priest of Apollo.

Be this as it may, and be the arrival of the Virgilian family in Italy by land or by sea as it may, when Virgil moved south to Rome and Naples, and became acquainted with the writings of Hebrew prophets, either through Pollio or Sibylline oracles, or the Septuagint,

or through a Jewish slave, Alexis, or another, he immediately recognised an inspiration kindred to his own, and determined if life did but last him (*G.* 3, 10, *modo vita supersit*) to master, and appropriate, and lay at his Apollo's feet all that was best in the literature of Palestine, as he actually did take captive and lay under tribute, and convey to Mantua the best poetry of Greece. 'I will be the first to return to my native land, bringing with me, if life do but last, the Muses from Aonian heights, the first to lead in triumph to Mantua the poetry of Sion':

G. 3, 10-12.

Primus ego in patriam mecum, modo vita
supersit,
Aonio rediens deducam vertice Musas;
Primus Idumæas referam tibi, Mantua, palmas.

But unhappily his life did not last. Yet even so his proclaimed intention and the virginal purity of his days devoted to the priesthood of the gentile god of song and prophecy were instinctively recognised and honoured by grateful ages of the Christian Church, which counted Maro also among the prophets: 'Maro vates gentilium' generally in close connection with the Sibyl (*Teste David cum Sibylla*). The learned saints may have recognised that the whole *Aeneid* is but another Old Testament recording the story of another outcast chosen people, wandering until under the guidance of their God most high they entered (with the ark of their covenant) their own promised land and waited long and long for the fulfilment of the prophesied destiny of their race, culminating in a Child Divine. The learned saints may among other passages also have been struck by the strange coincidence between the sacrificial procedure demanded from Aeneas by the gentile prophetess Deiphobe preparatory to her prophesying (*A.* 6, 37), and that demanded as a preliminary ceremonial by another gentile prophet Balaam from Balak. The Sibyl says to Aeneas: 'This is the moment to slay seven bullocks from a healthy herd, and the same number of picked sheep.' And Balaam says to Balak: 'Build me seven altars and prepare me seven oxen and seven rams.' This can hardly have been mere accident.

A secular student might even go further, and in the light of old commentaries discern Virgil, not hunting for pearls in unlikely kailyard places—his avowed object in exploring early Latin poets—but reverently poring over the Book of Kings or the Book of Numbers in his Septuagint translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, to find a specimen palm to bring from Edom to Mantua, and joyfully lighting on the story of Balaam, the son of Beor—the man whose eyes were opened to see the angel of the Lord standing in the way with his sword drawn in his hand, and he bowed down his head, and fell flat on his face:

A. 2, 332.

Oppositi, stat ferri acies mucrone corusco
Stricta, parata neci;

or the story of Elisha praying the Lord to open the eyes of the young man that he might see: 'And the Lord opened the eyes of the young

man, and he saw, and behold the mountains were full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha, and they that were with them were more than they that were against them.' Hence rather than from Troyland, the scene of unsurpassed grandeur, where Venus opened the eyes of Aeneas that he might behold the pitilessness of the gods working the destruction of Ilium. 'Unveiled to view are the dread forms of the Olympian concert of the great powers unfriendly to Troy' (and they that were against them were more than they that were with them).

A. 2, 622-3.

Apparent dirae facies, inimicaque Trojae
Numina magna deum.

The broken half-line, the pause, the blank, for Aeneas (had he but the leisure) to bow down his head and fall flat on his face.

R. W. RAPER.

SOME REPUNCTUATIONS.

Cicero, *Ep. ad Q. Fratrem*, ii. 9.

Lucreti poemata ut scribis ita sunt multis
luminibus ingeni multae tamen artis. Sed cum
veneris.

The text of these famous words is now generally admitted to be sound and the emendations of Munro and others to be unnecessary. I am not so sure about the punctuation of them.

To take *ut scribis, ita sunt* as correlatives gives a sentence arranged on a pattern which is certainly good epistolary style: e.g. *ut scribis ita* video non minus incerta in republica quam in epistula tua (*Att.* ii. 15); prorsus *ut scribis ita* sentio (*Att.* ii. 17, 1); sin, *ut scribis ita* venies (*ib.* § 3); de domo et Curionis oratione *ut scribis ita* est (*Att.* iii. 20, 2); de Cicerone *ut scribis ita* faciam (*Att.* xii. 27, 2).

But they also fall into a well-attested pattern if we punctuate—

Lucreti poemata, ut scribis. Ita sunt multis
luminibus, etc.

The elliptical *ut scribis* is very characteristic of the more intimate correspondence, especially the hurried agitated notes of which there are so

many in the latter books *ad Atticum*, e.g.:

de Mustela, ut scribis: etsi magnum opus est
(xii. 47); de Vergilio, ut scribis (xii. 51, 1).

Most commonly the phrase opens with the preposition *de*; but not always. We find such variations as: ab ea igitur, ut scribis; et velim confecto negotio Faberiano (xiii. 30, 1); ad Dolabellam, ut scribis, ita puto faciendum, *καινότερα* quaedam et *πολιτικώτερα* (xiii. 10, 2); cum Mustela, quemadmodum scribis, cum venerit, Crispus (xii. 5a); sed, ut scribis, *ῥιζόθεμιν* magnum cum Antonio (xiv. 10, 3); Vettienum, ut scribis, et Faberium foveo (xv. 13, 3); tu igitur, ut scripsisti (xii. 46, 2). Nearest of all come such examples as:

Silius, ut scribis, hodie (xii. 29, 1).
cohaeredes, ut scribis, in Tusculano (xiii. 21a, 3).
cum holitore, ut videtur (*ad Tiron.* xvi. 20).
indicem cum Metrodoro, ut libebit (*ibid.*).
sed omnia ut voles (*Att.* xii. 17, 4).

Such verbs as venire, convenire, agere, facere are easily understood. Is it more difficult to supply *edenda curabo* with Lucreti poemata, ut scribis, in our sentence than it is to supply *dedicabo*

in the following: ad Dolabellam, ut scribis, ita puto faciendum? The example xiii. 25, I de Andromene, ut scribis. Ita putaram, shows that the *ita* and *ut* may be near together and yet not strictly correlative.

The meaning of the first part of the sentence will then be—'that poem of Lucretius—I'll do as you suggest with it.' The remaining words will mean: 'It is so full of natural brilliance and yet such craftsmanship as well.' They will fall into the pattern of such sentences as:

ita sunt alte repetitae radices (*de Rep.* iv. 4).
ita sunt altae stirpes stultitiae (*Tusc.* iii. 13).
ita multi sermones perscripti sunt (*Acad.* ii. 74).
ita multa dicunt quae vix intelligam (*de Fin.* iv. 2).

ita sunt multi quibus videtur, etc. (*Tusc.* i. 116).

The whole question is perhaps rather much ado about little, though not nothing: for the historical value of the sentence is considerably increased if it states that Cicero not merely assents to a judgment expressed by Quintus, but consents to a request of his to do something with the poem. This is surely a strong confirmation of St. Jerome's report *quos postea Cicero emendavit*. It does not dispose of the view that Quintus was the editor, for Marcus expressly reserves the matter until his brother's coming. *Sed ut veneris*.

✓ Virgil, *Georg.* ii. 61-72.

Mr. J. Sargeant, who is a botanist as well as a scholar, pointed out to me the absurdity of the vulgate text of this passage and led me towards the correction which is here put forward. No more than a repunctuation is necessary in order to acquit Virgil of saying that ash, poplar, oak, palm and pine are propagated by slips or sets (*plantis*). The general sequence of this thought is as follows:

Regular nursery training is required for all, and costly in labour at that (61-2). But there are various processes which suit various sorts: *trunci* for the olive, *propago* for the vine, *solidum robur* for the myrtle, *plantae* for the hazel.

(Here let me remark that by every canon of textual criticism *ecdurae* or *edurae* is potior lectio in 65.)

Next he starts a new classification:

some trees sow themselves in the course of nature (*nativae*), others are grafted by art (*insitivae*); to the *nativae* belong ash, poplar, oak, etc.; to the *insitivae*, walnut, chestnut, etc. All of which is agreeable to reason, and all of which is expressed in the text if we punctuate:

Sed truncis oleae melius, propagine vites respondent, solido Paphiae de robore myrtus, plantis ecdurae coryli. *Nascuntur* et ingens fraxinus, Herculeaeque arbos umbrosa coronae, Chaonliue patris glandes; etiam ardua palma nascitur, et casus abies visura marinos. *Inseritur* vero et fetu nucis arbutus horrida, et steriles platani malos gessere valentis, castaneas fagus; ornusque incanuit albo flore piri, glandemque sues fregere sub ulmis.

Nascuntur and *inseritur* carry all the emphasis of contrasting two kinds: therefore they stand foremost in their sentences. The vexed question of *castaneas fagos* or *castaneas fagus*, which Servius discusses—and, if *fagos*, what case *fagos* may be—is nothing to my present point.

Georg. i. 163.

tardaque Eleusinae matris volventia plaustra.

Eleusinus novavit poeta pro *Eleusinius*, says Heyne: which may pass. *Tarda* pro *tardum*, *tarde*: the same interpreter, followed by the rest. Bénéit alleges

Georg. ii. 377.

aut gravis incumbens scopulis arentibus aestas as a parallel: but this parallel fails, inasmuch as *incumbens scopulis arentibus* (=cum incumbit) is a perfect verbal clause, and *volventia* in our passage must either, as Servius says, be an adjective = volubilia . . . or, as one of the other scholiasts (L in Thilo-Hagen) observes, it is for us *quaerendum quid sit volventia plaustra Eleusinae matris*.

Accepting this scholiast's invitation, and inquiring what are these three clumsily piled attributes, I conclude that they proceed from an early misreading of a single letter, or a single stroke above a letter, and that Virgil wrote:

tardaque {Eleusinam } matris volventia, plaustra.
 {Eleusinem }
matris is an acc. plural.

'the slow waggons, the waggons which trundle the matrons (of Attica) along the road to Eleusis.'

ἐπὶ τῆς ἀμάξης ὁχοῦμεναι αἱ γυναῖκες αἱ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐπὶ τὰ Ἐλευσίνια ἐβάδιζον εἰς τὰ μεγάλα μυστήρια ἐλοιδόρουν ἀλλήλας ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ.
Suidas τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἀμαξῶν σκώμματα.

(See Commentators on Demosth. *de Cor.* 122.)

To anybody who is familiar with Greek literature, when speaking of Eleusis and the agricultural inventions

attributed to it, no allusion could be more obvious, as a literary ornament for *plaustra*, than the procession from Athens.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

The University, Glasgow.

NOTES

THE AGRARIAN LEGISLATION OF SPURIUS THORIUS.

Σπόριος Θόριος (MSS. Βόριος) δημαρχῶν ἐσηγήσατο νόμον, τὴν μὲν γῆν μηκέτι διανέμειν, ἀλλ' εἶναι τῶν ἐχόντων, καὶ φόρους ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς τῷ δημῷ κατατίθεσθαι, καὶ τὰδε τὰ χρήματα χωρεῖν ἐς δαίονμάς.

(Appian, *B.C.* I. 27. 2.)

Spurius Thorius . . . qui agrum publicum uitiosa et inutili lege uectigali leuauit (Cic. *Brut.* 36. 136).

DR. HARDY¹ has advanced some very strong reasons for identifying the 'uitiosa et inutilis lex' with the legislation of Tib. Gracchus, and for making Thorius the author of the law attributed to him by Appian and not of the *Lex Agraria* of 111 B.C., as most scholars hold. But a difficulty arises with regard to the nature of the relief which Thorius is said to have afforded to the public land. Dr. Hardy translates Cic. *Brut.* 136, 'He relieved the public land from an irregular and useless law by imposing a "uectigal,"' and adds, 'Cicero was aware that this law of Thorius practically repealed the Gracchan measure. He was also aware that Thorius imposed or insisted on a "uectigal" from public land. Not quite accurately he makes the latter the instrument of the former. He would have been more accurate if he had said he relieved the public land of a useless law by abolishing the land commission,' the abolition being implied in the phrase τὴν μὲν γῆν μηκέτι διανέμειν.

Is it not possible that the relief from the law of Gracchus really consisted (at least partially) in the imposition of a 'uectigal'? Appian says that Tib. Grac-

chus offered to the deprived possessors compensation for improvements in the shape of τὴν ἐξαίρετον ἀνευ τιμῆς κτήσιν ἐς αἰὲ βέβαιον ἐκάστω πεντακοσίων πλέθρων, and gives no hint that this provision was ever withdrawn from the bill. The only satisfactory meaning which can be attached to τιμή here seems to be 'that which is paid in token of value,' i.e. the τέλος τῶν ἐτησίων καρπῶν. [It is impossible satisfactorily to connect ἀνευ τιμῆς with τιμὴν προσλαμβάνοντας in Plut. *C. Gracchus*, IX. 2; for while each phrase refers to some compensation for the possessors, the former evidently took a negative form, and the latter a positive. Plutarch clearly refers to a gift to be paid to the possessors by the State, as contrasted with the fine (μετὰ ζημίας) which they deserved to pay. Although he hints that this provision was omitted in the final draft of the bill, 'his words do not necessarily imply that the original concessions mentioned by Appian were removed' (Greenidge, *History of Rome*, p. 121, n.).]

According to this interpretation, then, Thorius re-imposed the customary state dues which Gracchus had remitted to possessors who suffered deprivation under his law. Another consideration supports this view. There is no hint in Appian that this provision of Thorius law was 'only a legal enforcement of existing custom, which had perhaps tended of late to become obsolete': his phrasing seems to suggest the imposition of a new tax, and this suggestion is confirmed by the statement of the purpose to which the proceeds of the tax were to be applied.

[Following Mommsen and Dr. Hardy I have assumed that 'uectigali' in *Brut.* 136 is a noun and instrumental. It

¹ *Six Roman Laws*, pp. 47, 48.

would be more natural to take it as an adjective and privative, if 'lex uectigalis' is admissible Latin for a 'lex de uectigalibus lata.' The phrase would then denote that portion of the Gracchan legislation which dealt with the remission of the 'uectigalia' to the old possessors, and, perhaps, with the rents to be paid by the new class of small holders.]

F. C. THOMPSON.

University College, Cardiff.

NOTE ON HORACE, ODES,

I. VI. I, 2.

Scriberis Vario fortis et hostium
victor Maeonii carminis alite.

I have no new interpretation to add to the ἀχθος ἀπούρης that already encumbers editions of Horace on this passage, perhaps the most troublesome in the *Odes*, but merely would ask why we should not go back to the earlier authorities. It is not necessary to enumerate the editors who take *Vario* . . . *alite* as an ablative, of the agent without *ab*, and the passages they quote in illustration, usually felt to be unsatisfactory; nor those who explain as an ablative, absolute, or ablative of attendant circumstances; nor yet those who boldly emend to *aliti* or *aemulo*; are they not all written in the commentaries? It is probable that few scholars are satisfied with any of these interpretations, and therefore it seems the more surprising that modern editors (so far as I am aware) neglect the aid of the Pseudo-Acron and the Commentator Cruquianus, who separate *Maeonii carminis alite* from *Vario*, and explain as *Homericiis auspiciis*. This gives an excellent sense: 'You shall be written of . . . by Varius, under the auspices of epic song,' i.e. 'under the auspices of Homer,' taking *Vario* as dative.¹

There are numerous passages to be cited for a similar use of *alite*. I append those I have noted:

Epodes x. 1. *Mala soluta navis exit alite.*
Ibid., xvi. 23, 24. *Secunda*
ratem occupare quid moramur *alite*?

¹ For similar examples of dative with passive verb cf. e.g. Verg. *Aen.* I. 440, neque cernitur ulli; Hor. *Ep.* I. xix. 3, quae scribuntur aquae potioribus (see Wilkins, *ad loc.*).

Odes III. iii. 61. Troiae renascens *alite*
lugubri Fortuna.

Ibid. IV. vi. 23, 24. *potiore ductos*
alite muros.

Catullus LXI. 19, 20. bona cum bona
nubet *alite* virgo.

Add also Hor. *Odes* I. xv. 5. *Mala ducis*
avi domum.

Horace's frugal habit of using again both his own materials and phrases from Catullus should deter any one from offering an interpretation which cannot be supported by parallel examples, but the passages I have quoted seem to me to be adequate. The lines under consideration merely differ in having *Maeonii carminis*, i.e. a descriptive genitive, in place of the adjectives *lugubri*, *potiore*, etc., surely not a vital distinction. Moreover, the passages given above substantiate Horace's use of *ales* or *avis* as meaning 'auspices' or 'omen'; whereas I note in Professor Shorey's edition of the *Odes* that for 'bird' = 'bard' he only quotes two Horatian parallels. One of these is *Odes* II. xx. 9-12:

Iam iam residunt cruribus asperae
pelles, et album mutior in *alitem*
superne, nascunturque leves
per digitos humerosque plumae.

Obviously here *alitem* does not equal 'poet'; the sense is 'the top part of me will be changed into a white-winged creature' (wings opposed to *cruribus* in the previous line); it is the whole stanza that gives the idea of the poet's metamorphosis, emphasised further by *canorus ales* in the next stanza, presumably a periphrasis for 'swan.'

The other reference is even less to the point, *Odes* IV. ii. 25:

Multa Dircaeum levat aura *cycnum*.

In the first place *cycnus* is a much more specialised word than *ales*; and in the second it is used here in part at least to point the contrast with the *apis Matinae*, two lines below.

It would seem, then, that apart from the difficulty of taking *Vario* as ablative there is far better authority for explaining *alite* as 'bird' = 'auspices,' rather than as 'bird' = 'bard.'

G. M. HIRST.

Barnard College, Columbia University.

'ITALUS' AND 'ROMANUS.'¹

I SEE that Mr. John MacInnes in his paper on this subject writes ' (Plautus) scoffs at Praenestine idiom in *Trin.* 609, though in *Trin.* 545 he praises the "Campanum genus" for endurance.' But is not this praise itself a scoff?

¹ *Classical Review*, February, p. 5.

Wagner in his note says, 'The taunt implied in the present passage is very bitter and unfeeling.' The Campanians had been working so long as slaves, a punishment inflicted on them for their anti-Roman policy, that even the Syrians could not be reckoned so long suffering.

ALFRED CHURCH.

REVIEWS

LES SOURCES DE LUCAIN.

Les Sources de Lucain. Par RENÉ PICHON, Docteur ès Lettres, Professeur de Première Supérieure au Lycée Henri IV. Royal 8vo. 1 vol. Pp. iv + 279. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1912.

It is appropriate that this work, by far the most complete examination of the literary antecedents of Lucan, should emanate from a country where the poet has had a succession of admirers at once enthusiastic and discriminating; but it is even more peculiarly appropriate that the author should be M. René Pichon. For not only does he command the respect of scholars owing to the breadth of his knowledge and taste throughout the whole range of Latin literature, but he also confesses to a personal affection for Lucan which the attentive reader might in any case divine to be the constant inspiration of this able and exhaustive book. 'Je voudrais que mon travail,' says M. Pichon, 'aidât à mieux comprendre un poète que j'ai toujours aimé, et que j'aime encore mieux depuis que je l'ai plus patiemment étudié.' The author's wish must be assured; for his work will be indispensable for any just appreciation of the poet. It may be remarked at once that this regard for Lucan in a critic has its dangers as well as its advantages; and there are portions of M. Pichon's book in which, if I may so put it, he is too kind to Lucan—almost too ingenious in finding excuses for his misstatements, too tolerant of his wearisome digressions, too appreciative of the originality of his borrowings, too

laudatory of the poetic qualities in his powerful rhetoric. With some reservations, however, and a disinclination to go so far on certain questions, the present writer feels himself frequently in substantial accord with the author.

The inquiry is largely historical, as must be inevitable from the nature of the subject-matter; and it is reasonable therefore that the consideration of the historical sources should occupy approximately three-fifths of the book, and the philosophical and literary sources about one-fifth each. The historical sources are examined under the heads of 'accessory facts,' 'account of the civil war,' and 'alterations of history.' For the mass of accessory or episodic material, much of it merely allusive or decorative, a sufficient source was the standard academic learning, amplified by Lucan's own observation and experience—he had been a quaestor, an augural priest, and had travelled, it will be remembered. Many incidents from national history would be as familiar to him as 'le quatorze juillet ou le neuf thermidor' to a Frenchman. Some geographical treatise or treatises he must have consulted; his serpent-lore and catalogue of snake-bites could easily be derived from the Latin of Macer without recourse to Nicander; his information regarding Egypt was likely enough found in Seneca's work on Egypt, and not in the *Quaestiones Naturales*; while a good deal more came from the writer to whom he owed his main theme—Livy. Thus it is a commendable suggestion that Lucan's

excursus upon Gaul, and the account of Druidism, were taken from lost portions of Livy, who, according to M. Pichon's *obiter dictum*, had made a 'contaminatio' of Posidonius and Caesar. So far, all is comparatively plain sailing; for the accessory facts do not involve many stormy disputes.

But problems the most serious beset the account of the civil war, where intricate argument is needed to dispose of some theories and to establish others. M. Pichon's position is in the main a reaffirmation of Baier's theory—now over a generation old, and the outcome of a hint given by Reifferscheid to Baier, his pupil—that Livy was practically the one source of Lucan's historical material. With convincing skill M. Pichon addresses himself to the emancipation of Baier's hypothesis from the exaggerations of Ziehen and Vitelli, and to its championship against the objections of Westerburg and Ussani. Case after case is examined with a view to gauging the amount of agreement, or the reason for variation, between Lucan and authors who drew material from Livy, such as Velleius, Florus, Appian, Dio, and Plutarch. The author is also concerned to maintain the genuine historical worth of Lucan. Hence, while he recognises many of the poet's inaccuracies, omissions, and distortions, he greatly minimises the indictment of error, makes light of several mistakes and absurdities recorded by Heitland, and wards off all really damaging attacks on his historical exactitude.

To follow the arguments in detail is impossible here. One must be content with a selection. A becoming fulness is shown in things Gallic—*e.g.* (pp. 26 *sqq.*), in the discussion of Lucan's frequently criticised characterisation of the tribes of Gaul by epithets and the alleged disorder in their mention. M. Pichon ranges himself beside M. Salomon Reinach and M. Jullian, as against M. Lejay, in justification of Lucan's accuracy, and claims that, granted a transposition of Arverni and Treviri, the list of tribes would follow a methodical arrangement. The epithets, he maintains, are not applied at haphazard, but may be supported, some on historical, some on philological, some on

archaeological grounds. In this latter connexion, the defence of the *picta arma* of the Lingones as containing 'une allusion aux boucliers ornés d'émail que l'on fabriquait à Bibracte' must interest everyone who has seen the Aeduan antiquities from Mont Beuvray at Autun. Again, take the divergence of authorities on the nationality of the slave who was ordered to kill Marius. The *Periocha* of Livy, the *Commentum Bernense* and Appian would have him a Gaul; Velleius, Valerius Maximus and Lucan make him a Cimbrian; while Plutarch gives both traditions without adhesion to either. What conclusion is to be drawn? Ussani concludes that there were two independent accounts, the one Livy's, followed by the *Epitome*, by the scholiast on Lucan and by Appian; the other that of some different historian (perhaps Valerius Antias), followed by Velleius, Valerius Maximus and Lucan. But M. Pichon has a more likely solution—Livy probably reported two accounts, as he often does, and decided for the Gallic origin; then, of those who consulted Livy, some accepted his conclusion, while others of a rhetorical tendency preferred the dramatic contrast of bringing the conqueror of the Cimbri face to face with one of the tribe.

Apropos of another question of accuracy, that raised by II. 665-666 where Lucan is supposed to imagine ignorantly that Mount Eryx in Sicily could fall into the Aegean Sea, M. Pichon prefers emendation to the explanation that Lucan is thinking in general terms of 'an Eryx' falling into 'an Aegean.' In a line beclouded with conjectures ('nubes est coniecturarum,' as Francken remarks), he ventures on what is at least a fair geographical correction, *Aegati* = *Aegatii*, for the common reading of the MSS., *Aegaei*.

Noteworthy acumen marks the series of arguments (pp. 69-79) which defeat Westerburg's attempt to derive Florus from Lucan instead of from Livy. The weakness of his position is convincingly shown by his reliance on trivial verbal similarities and by his actually founding on an error of Florus which he surmises is due to a misunderstanding of

Lucan, as if Florus might not have been equally capable of misunderstanding Livy! M. Pichon's pithy comment is 'Son contre-sens ne porte pas en soi de certificat d'origine.' Ussani's contentions are in turn subjected to searching analysis, and their frailty exhibited.

Regarding the arrangement of the Pompeians at Pharsalia it is well known that the accounts of Caesar, Lucan, Appian and Plutarch do not coincide except for the centre, which they all assign to Scipio. An incisive analysis makes it extremely probable that Lucan's account is, through the intermediary of Livy, ultimately in agreement with Caesar's; while the Greek writers Appian and Plutarch have reproduced their Latin original inaccurately.

M. Pichon is ready to admit that Lucan not only invents much, but makes daring departures from fact, as in his notorious introduction of Cicero among the counsellors of Pompey on the eve of the decisive battle. His omissions and transpositions are sometimes those of the artist, sometimes those of the partisan. Similarly there are distortions of history due to bias; only, it does not follow that in every case the prejudice began with Lucan. A very considerable share of animus may have been bequeathed by the historian who was twitted with having proved himself a good 'Pompeian.'

When it comes to questions of veracity between Caesar and Lucan, and when allowance is made for the 'personal equation' of two biased authorities, the gulf cannot be fixed so widely as many have thought. Such divergences as that concerning the attitude of senators in Rome towards Caesar after Pompey's flight or that concerning the situation of Ilerda may be appreciably lessened on subjective grounds; since in the one case a 'passive resistance' which Caesar might consider rank rebellion would be in the eyes of 'Pompeians' like Livy and Lucan scandalous weakness; and in the other case, if Caesar's 'mountain' with 'precipitous places' becomes a 'gently sloping hill' in Lucan (*B. C. I.* xlv; *Phars.* IV. 11), it is plausible to hold that the one wishes to overstate and

the other to understate the difficulty. *In medio veritas.*

And so throughout the historical division the case is maintained by means of able reasoning and attractive conjecture—but, be it remembered, conjecture after all, which in many problems nothing short of the reappearance of the lost books of Livy could raise into certainty. A recollection of this makes statements about that which 'devait être' or 'ne devait pas être' in Livy sound arbitrary, even though deduced from strong probabilities or recognised Livian usages.

On the sources of Lucan's philosophy there is less ground for dispute. Between critics like Heitland who over-emphasise the systematic nature of Lucan's Stoicism and those like Souriau who overemphasise its contradictions, M. Pichon steers a sane middle course. To search for absolute consistency in his thought is logically to end in the negative conclusion of M. Lejay, that Lucan had no philosophy. But his family traditions, if nothing else, made him a Stoic, and Stoic he remained despite human lapses into pessimism and literary excursions into the ancient mythology. Judicious stress is laid on the value of Seneca's eloquent *Consolatio ad Liviam* as bringing Lucan's views into clear daylight.

The last chapter is devoted to literary sources. The attitude adopted towards the Virgilian influence operative on Lucan is thoroughly sound. Although M. Pichon recognises that Lucan is not to be called a disciple of Virgil, he fully acknowledges his debt—a debt inevitable owing to the education of the times, and indeed so manifest that Merivale's denial of it remains a standing marvel. At the same time, the debt is stated more temperately than in Heitland's elaborate list, which seems to me not infrequently to discover parallels where no parallels are. Yet even so, among M. Pichon's instances, there are some which I personally should think doubtful: e.g. (p. 226) why must the vanishing of Julia's ghost be modelled on that of Creusa's? And why must the agony of a father over his dying son be modelled on Anna's anguish over Dido? In these cases there are not

even verbal resemblances to support the vague analogy of incident.

The evidence adduced by Hosius (*Rh. Mus.* XLVIII.) to trace the influence upon Lucan's style of Manilius, *Aetna*, the earlier books of Livy, and Quintus Curtius, is subjected to minute investigation. This problem has much interest in its bearing on works so dubious in date as the *Astronomica*, *Aetna* and *Historiae Alexandri*; but Hosius' evidence unfortunately amounts to little, and M. Pichon is for the most part laudably cautious in admitting as proof phrases that are too ordinary, although even he inclines to allow over-much weight to such a phrase as *conscendere currus* (p. 237). The similarities between Curtius and Lucan are not very impressive; and the rejection of Hosius' arguments will generally commend itself. Some of the likeness in words depends upon analogy of facts—deserts, for example, are much alike everywhere and will be usually described in similar terms; other resemblances are arguably due to community of source; and others still are no miracles at all, but part of the common stock of Latin literature.

An Appendix on the 'Composition of the *Pharsalia*' deals first with the chronological limits intended for the poem. That it would have come down, if finished, to Thapsus and the suicide of Cato is M. Pichon's view. This seems likely, though one may doubt the validity of his argument for twelve books on the ground that, as the necromancy of *Pharsalia* VI. suggests the descent to the Lower World in *Aeneid* VI.,

therefore Lucan would have composed twelve books to correspond to Virgil's twelve. The arguments for a contemplated prolongation to the death of Caesar are not entered into, and in reality they do not seem very cogent. Finally, there is the question as to which were the *tres libri* mentioned in Vacca's life of Lucan as having been composed before the others. Ussani thinks I, VII., IX.; M. Pichon thinks II., VII., VIII. Personally I should think I., II., VII. a more likely group than either of these; but in all the suggestions there are difficulties touching Lucan's attitude to Caesar and Nero; and one is driven back to the traditional view as one which presents at least as few difficulties, namely, that I., II., III. constituted the *tres libros quales uidemus*. After all, it is the most natural interpretation of Vacca's words.

In passing, I ought to say that Pichon's suggestion of the identity of the *Orpheus* and the *Catachthonion* among the lost works seems to me, for reasons which there is not space to discuss, absolutely impossible.

There are a few *errata*. Besides occasional omission of punctuation marks, especially full stops, there are misprints such as *ausi* for *aussi* (p. 12, l. 19), *ereurs* for *erreurs* (p. 110, l. 2), *nbique* for *ubique* (p. 236, l. 23); *trouble* (p. 172, l. 9) wants an accent, and *greco romain* (p. 176, l. 26) a hyphen. It is probably more important to point out that on p. 40, l. 19, the argument requires that *la seconde* should be corrected to *la première*.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

REFORM IN GRAMMATICAL NOMENCLATURE.

- (i.) *Reform in Grammatical Nomenclature. A Symposium (University Bulletin)* issued by the University of Michigan. New series. Vol. xiii. No. 6 reprinted from the *School Review*, 1911-12. 8vo. Pp. 64.
- (ii.) *Vorschläge des Wiener Ausschusses für einfache und einheitliche Fachausdrücke im Sprachunterricht*. Gebilligt vom Wiener Neuphilologischen Verein: Sokoll. Wien, January, 1912.
- (iii.) *Grammar and Thinking: a Study of the Working Conceptions of Syntax*. By A. D. SHEFFIELD. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1912.

THESE volumes afford welcome evidence that the movement in favour of a reform in grammatical terminology is spreading and indeed assuming an international character. The matter is also to be discussed at the next meeting of the

Neuphilologentag, when a report will be presented. Meanwhile the scheme of terminology recommended by the English Joint Committee has been unanimously approved by the two leading Teachers' Associations of South Africa, and a Joint Committee has been formed to translate the recommendations into Dutch.

In America two committees have been at work, one appointed by the Modern Language Association of America to deal with the terminology of the modern languages, the other appointed by the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association on the initiative of Mr. Rounds of the State Normal School, Whitewater, Wisconsin, and dealing with the terminology of English alone. But neither of these committees was concerned with the terminology of Latin or Greek; and two independent and unrelated reports might easily have led to confusion. It is, therefore, a matter of congratulation that a new committee of fifteen was appointed last year on the motion of Professor Kelsey and others, on which the Modern Language Association of America, the National Education Association and the American Philological Association are represented. This Joint Committee held its first meeting at Chicago last December, under the chairmanship of Professor Hale. It will deal with the classical as well as the modern languages, and, if one may judge from the attitude taken up by Professor Hale in his papers contributed to the *Symposium*, it will proceed on the same general principle as the English Joint Committee, viz. that the harmonising of grammatical nomenclature in all the high school languages is a desirable thing. 'At present the teachers of English, of German, of French, of Spanish, of Latin, of Greek, seem to have nothing in common in dealing with the syntax of their respective languages. They are not working under an aim of mutual helpfulness, or even with the thought of the possibility of such an aim.' 'The common opinion is that each language has its own individual syntax. . . . If this is true, I have been very much at fault, for I have often told my students

that the best way to get a sound feeling for the mass of Latin subjunctive uses was to read French, Shakespeare and the English Bible.' 'The present condition of things is wasteful of time to the student, and intellectually intolerable.' In this sense the *Congrès International des professeurs de langues vivantes* passed a resolution at its meeting in Paris, April, 1909, calling for an international commission to prepare a unified grammatical terminology. It is unfortunate that in the scheme of terminology drawn up by the French Commission (which was appointed before the movement in favour of a *unified* as well as *simplified* scheme of terminology was inaugurated) and officially adopted by the French Ministry of Public Instruction, no account is taken of the terminology of any language except French; the recent adoption of this limited reform may be a difficulty (though, it is to be hoped, not an insuperable one) in the path of progress towards a more ambitious scheme, such as is now being demanded in so many different countries. It is probable that an international conference will be needed. Meanwhile, as Professor Hale says, each country must take the initial steps of putting its own results into practice. For it is more important that each country should have a unified and consistent scheme of its own than that all the countries should have the same scheme. The first steps in this direction have already been taken by the Misses F. W. and E. Harrison in their *Beginner's English Grammar* (Longmans, Green and Co., 1911), by Mr. Alfred West in the revised edition of his *English Grammar* (Cambridge University Press, 1912), by Mr. J. D. Rose in his *Advanced English Grammar through Composition* (George Bell and Sons, 1912), and by myself in my *New Latin Grammar* and *New French Grammar* (Oxford University Press, 1912).

I hope that the report of the American Committee now sitting will not be unnecessarily delayed. It has before it the report of the English Joint Committee as a basis of discussion. On the other hand, it is bound to take account of the terms now in use in America and to

bring its recommendations so far as possible into touch with the prevailing American usage. That this is no small order is shown by some statistics given by Mr. Rounds. Referring to American children, he says: 'They find themselves balked and baffled at every turn by a shifting, uncertain and tricky terminology.' 'I find in American grammars nine different names for the construction of *good* in *He is good*, and eighteen different names for the construction of *red* in *We painted our barn red*.' The names which are selected by the Committee must be not only fit and sensible, but also 'current coin in every classroom.' In such a matter as this there must be some amount of 'give and take.' As Mr. Rounds says, the question for each teacher to ask himself is this: Is not the great good that would come from uniformity worth more than the satisfaction which would come to me from having my own way?

This preliminary *Symposium* contains a few suggestions which will have to be considered by the Committee of Fifteen. As a name for the adjective in a *good man* Professor Hale suggests the term 'adherent adjective,' as indicating its 'close attachment' to its noun; the adjectives in *the boy, happy and careless, paid no attention* he would call 'appositive'; the adjectives in *the boy was happy and careless* he agrees with the English Joint Committee in calling 'predicative (or 'predicate') adjectives.' He disapproves of the term 'epithet adjective,' adopted by the English Joint Committee for the first two uses, on the ground that the word 'epithet' has acquired a special meaning which has conquered the primitive one. But surely it is allowable in grammar to use a word in a special technical sense. And the term is not new in this sense: it is used, for example, in the *Public School Latin Primer* by Kennedy (p. 75 of the edition of 1878). 'Attributive,' the term which the English Committee rejected, he also rejects; but he fails to note that one reason for rejecting it is that it denotes attributing (just as 'predicative' denotes predicating) and is therefore really better suited to the adjective which forms part of the predicate than to the epithet adjective.

The main reason for its rejection is, however, that it is used by French grammarians in the sense of 'predicative.'

The Austrian *Vorschläge*, emanating from a Committee of fifteen members, appointed by the Modern Language Association of Vienna, and presided over by Hofrat Professor Jakob Schipper, are based on a limited programme of work; their object is to introduce order in terminology at points in which noticeable contradictions exist in current usage. But in carrying out this programme the Committee has found it necessary to outline a complete scheme of grammatical terms. Improvements in the current terminology are shown in the division of the sentence into two parts (the Subject and the Predicate), and in the term 'Präteritum' (Past) as the name of the tense of the German *schrieb* and the English *wrote*, which have hitherto been described by the inadequate name *Imperfectum*.

On the other hand, no attempt is made to bring the tenses of French or Latin or Greek into touch with the German tenses. Nor is the name 'Present Perfect' as a description of the German *hat geschrieben* entirely satisfactory: for the tense is often used simply to mark an action as having taken place in the past, without any special reference to present time; it corresponds, in fact, like the French Perfect, to the English *wrote* as well as to *has written*. The term 'conditional' is retained, but used as the name of a *tense*, not of a mood (*he would write* 'conditional tense'). This idea was considered by the English Joint Committee and rejected as not a satisfactory solution of the difficulty. It is interesting to note that a reform in current terminology is demanded by Modern Language Associations at least as much as by Associations of classical scholars.

Mr. Sheffield's book deserves a much fuller notice than I can give it in this brief article. He discusses a number of fundamental points in grammar, and discusses them with insight and a wide acquaintance with the literature of the subject, including the Report of the English Joint Committee. 'The dis-

cussions upon this movement make it increasingly clear that questions of terminology must be approached through a fresh appraisal of the notions that our terms presuppose.' This is undoubtedly true; and it was not forgotten by our Joint Committee, which spent much of its time precisely in appraising the grammatical notions which lie at the basis of our terms of accidence and syntax. Mr. Sheffield is specially interesting in his dealings with the cases and 'cases-phrases' (a term which he adopts from the Report of our Joint Committee)—for

example, as to the survival of a feeling for the dative in French even where the case-form itself is lost (p. 159). He quotes with approval the remark that the ordinary attitude of traditional grammar towards what it calls the lack of inflexions in some modern languages shows rather a lack of flexibility in the grammarian. The book should be read by all who are taking a part in the movement which is the subject of this article.

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

SENECA'S *HERCULES FURENS* AND *HERCULES OETAEUS*
(OTTO EDERT), KIEL, 1909.

DR. EDERT'S dissertation is a very useful piece of work, and throws much light on the Tragedies of Seneca—a subject which does not often engage the public attention. Of these plays none is more characteristic of its author than the *Hercules Furens*; and speculations about it, based upon a comparison with its Euripidean prototype, are interesting to students not only of Senecan drama but of Senecan philosophy. Dr. Edert maintains, quite rightly, that we have here much more than a silver age rhetorician's version of 'Ἡρακλῆς Μαινόμενος'. Seneca's play is of course penetrated through and through by rhetoric; but the rhetoric serves a purpose, which is not the purpose of the Greek. For Euripides' hero is an intensely dramatic human figure—a pathetic figure, now strong and now beaten to the ground by powers too mighty for him—always a man with the weaknesses and passion of humanity: Seneca's Hercules stands, in a sense, on higher ground. 'Nicht ein Beispiel menschlicher Schwäche, vordem der göttergleichen Steigerung menschlicher Natur—das ist der Herakles des Seneca.' Euripides' Heracles wishes to kill himself in the despair of a broken man. He is only turned from his purpose by the intervention of Theseus. In Seneca's play it is not in despair that Hercules thinks of suicide: he is the philosopher, still superior to fortune, and calmly contemplating self-destruction as possibly the

best way of showing his superiority. The whole play is 'a hymn to the greatness of Heracles': and, for that very reason, immeasurably inferior in dramatic interest to 'Ἡρακλῆς Μαινόμενος'. But if it is a poor play, it has a very strong and definite philosophic purpose. Dr. Edert dwells at some length—in this part of his essay, rather amplifying and expanding and adding further evidence where conclusions have already been drawn than striking out a precisely novel line—on the 'Heracles-legend' among philosophers, and shows with much erudition how the picture of the strong and patient hero appealed to Antisthenes and the Cynici—to whom he is the 'Idealbild eines kynischen Philosophen,' and who apparently made him the hero of philosophic tragedy—and how to the Stoics of the Roman empire Hercules became the type of wisdom and of beneficence. Seneca, whose philosophy is Stoic in the main, has written a tragedy of which the hero is nominally the Heracles of legend, but really the Stoic Wise Man or Superman. Such a situation as that provided by the 'To be or not to be' debate in Euripides' play would be naturally attractive to Stoic casuistry. Anyhow, Seneca 'nahm den kynisch-stoischen Herakles seiner Zeit, stellte ihn in einen aus Euripides entlehnten dramatischen Zusammenhang und goss das Ganze in die ihm gegebene Kunstform der rhetorischen Tragödie. Senecas eigentüm-

liche Leistung aber ist die Umbildung des alten Stoffes für den neuen Zweck.'

The second part of this essay deals with the much-disputed authorship of the *Hercules Oetaeus*, a play founded on the *Trachiniae* of Sophocles. This is a question which has divided the learned in recent years: F. Leo says that no one who knows Seneca's style could imagine him to be the author: Ackermann denies that there is anything in the play 'a Senecae ingenio atque indole alienum.' After a careful analysis of the *Hercules Oetaeus*, Edert agrees wholly with neither; but in the end he adopts Leo's conclusions, though not his premisses. So far as style goes, the play is 'Senecan': that is, it is full of declamatory, and very undramatic, treatment of given situations. Also, the protagonist is a Senecan or Stoic

Heracles. At the same time, its relation to the Latin *Hercules Furens* is such as to prove it, according to Edert, the work of an imitator, and a not very intelligent one. The author, he thinks, is 'no philosopher': he has misunderstood his Heracles: he does not clearly realise the Stoic position as to 'Standhaftigkeit' and self-destruction. Edert's analysis is interesting. But we have really nothing that points to a certain conclusion either way. For if uncertainty of philosophical conception is brought as evidence against Senecan authorship, it must be remembered on the other hand that Seneca himself, though his tenets in the main are those of the Porch, is not really a consistent Stoic.

A. D. G.

PRIMUS ANNUS.

Primus Annus. By W. L. PAINE and C. L. MAINWARING (Whitgift School, Croydon). With an introduction by S. O. ANDREW. Pp. 138. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. 2s.

Decem Fabulae. By W. L. PAINE, C. L. MAINWARING, and MISS E. RYLE. With a preface by W. H. D. ROUSE. Pp. 94. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. 1s. 6d.

THESE two volumes are the first of a series, whose object is to show in detail how Latin may be taught in our schools on direct and conversational methods. Of the two *Primus Annus*, I conceive, lays claim to the greater importance. As its name will, indeed, indicate, it divulges *κύβει γαίον* the ceremonial initiation, the mystic rites of the novice to the world; it presents to the teacher one line, which he may follow very broadly with a class in the first year of their learning Latin, modifying as he pleases on the way and giving range to his own spontaneity. It requires but one period a day, thus saving time for modern languages and science. It contains in all fifty-six lessons; 'in scope it includes practically all constructions, which do not involve the subjunctive

mood or oratio obliqua.'¹ In the earlier stages the class-room, in the later a Roman Family are the dominant topics. There are also some stories from classical mythology, introduced for the sake of variety. A complete recapitulation of both accidence and syntax is added, as also a list of *vocabula*, grouped under appropriate headings. A *Master's Book* is to follow very shortly, giving full suggestions as to the treatment of the lessons. As spontaneity is ever essential and a mechanical adherence to the letter of the lessons would (I conceive) be quite fatal to the method, this third volume will be eagerly welcomed.

The importance of this course will be evident. Not all teachers can go up to Bangor and witness even a brief series of Latin lessons, conducted by such experienced protagonists as the authors of the book I am dealing with. And here in large measure an answer will be found, based upon three years' experience and criticism of the proofs of the lessons with three different classes, to those insistent and most pertinent

¹ I note, by the way, that on p. 118 a subjunctive (*ut fiat*) is used. The 'Syntaxis' is intended for masters; but is it not also to be learnt by the boys?

questions: 'How and where shall we make a beginning? How put the direct methods into practice?'

Decem Fabulae—scenes from Roman life and also from classical mythology—can be acted by the pupil in the classroom or regarded as supplementary reading-matter, or may be produced in some more formal manner. The first play, *Pyramus et Thisbe*, is by Professor E. V. Arnold of Bangor and, I hear, has been acted in more than one school.

This first year course can be used by all teachers. To those, who would argue *non omnia possumus omnes*, our authors would reply with urbanity not *cuique in arte sua credendum* but *possunt, quia posse videntur* or

mutato nomine, de te
fabula narratur.

The authors of these original volumes have endeavoured to put themselves into a condition to be the champions and defenders of the ancient faith. And, though Erasmus and Milton have been long in the dust, all enthusiasts for classical culture should watch with interest, sympathetic and curious, the efforts being made to preserve for us some genuine knowledge of the *gloria linguae Latinae*, of those liberal and classical studies, which have ever been the proud possession of the great public schools since their first foundation. The appeal is, above all, to the ear. *Ego vero oppono auriculam . . . Sic me servavit Apollo.*

HAROLD P. COOKE.

SHORT NOTICES

Homeri Opera. Tomus V. Recognovit THOMAS W. ALLEN. Oxonii e Typographis Clarendoniano, 1912. 4s. 6d. cloth.

MR. ALLEN has crowned his edition of *Homer* in the Bibliotheca Oxoniensis with a fifth volume, containing the Homeric Hymns and fragments, the relics of the much-discussed Cyclic poems and all that is known concerning their contents, together with the *Batrachomyomachia* and the *Lives of Homer*.

The editor is one of our greatest authorities on the codices of the Homeric poems; and consequently a distinctive feature of this volume is the *Adnotatio Critica* and the array of MSS. on which it is based. In this respect the book is unique, as also in the comprehensive variety of its contents.

The great edition of *Homer* by Joshua Barnes, 1710, the '*Homerica navis*,' to which he entrusted, as he pathetically tells us, all his worldly wealth—it was really his wife's fortune, and we hope the good lady never suspected his beguiling story about King Solomon being the author of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*—carried nothing like so large a cargo of miscellaneous odds and ends.

NO. CCXXXI. VOL. XXVII.

The table of contents on p. vi contains no less than thirty-five separate items, a considerable bill-of-lading.

Mr. Allen has undoubtedly laid us all under an obligation to acknowledge his indefatigable labour in the collation of so vast a body of MSS. He has gained access to the Royal Libraries of Spain and certainly prosecutes his researches in this kind with admirable zeal and perseverance.

It is only when he comes to deal with his materials that there appears to be reason to doubt his capability and judgement. He relies too much on a corrupt tradition. As the saying is, he would translate through a stone wall. He is, of course, obliged to admit, indeed no one could possibly be blind to, the abounding errors of these MSS.: but beyond a number of easy and necessary corrections of the earliest editors, he is disposed to make a clean sweep of the work of subsequent scholars who have attempted to solve the puzzles presented by these corrupted fragments of for the most part undoubtedly ancient poetry. Mr. Allen, it is true, bestows praise on a few of us moderns, but we are kept under as severe a control as are Press correspondents at the seat of war in the near East, and find it as hard to

get an emendation past Mr. Allen, as they do to get a message past the official censor. The worst of it is, the few favoured emendations are generally such as do little credit to his judgement. In the result the text of the Hymns now issued is not very different from that of Allen and Sykes, 1904.

The Apparatus Criticus to the *Batrachomyomachia* is particularly full and comprehensive. The editor has apparently a special liking for that *jeu d'esprit*. The changes of the text from the *Oxford Homer* of 1896 are rather numerous. There is also a good deal of excision: but a little more regard might be paid with advantage to metrical accuracy.

On all these points, however, a further and a fuller discussion will appear elsewhere. For the present I conclude by suggesting to Mr. Allen that l. 262 implies the existence of some words preceding in which the true subject was expressly given, for example:—

261A. Κναίσων μὲν στυγερὴν φθάμενος
φύγε δειότητα
οἶκαδ' ἰὼν, πολέμου δὲ μετασχεῖν παῖδ'
ἐκέλευεν.

Our English ballad fixes the point of time more precisely:—

He fled full soon on the first of June,
But he bade the rest keep fighting.

Let me again congratulate Mr. Allen on the completion of his heavy task.

T. L. AGAR.

THE ARISTOXENIAN THEORY OF MUSICAL RHYTHM.

The Aristoxenian Theory of Musical Rhythm. By C. F. ABDY WILLIAMS, M.A., Mus. Bac. 1 vol. 8vo. Pp. xvi + 191. Numerous musical illustrations. Cambridge: University Press, 1911. 12s. 6d.

'THE plan of this book is to explain the principles of the Aristoxenian theory [of rhythm], using both ancient and modern examples in illustration, . . . and to apply the theoretical principles thus explained . . . to some of the masterpieces of modern art.' It is frankly based on Westphal's work, especially his *Allgemeine Theorie der musikalischen Rhythmik*,

which the author found so illuminating that he wished to share the pleasure and profit with his English fellow musicians. The plan is executed in the main with judgment and lucidity and in moderate compass. Rhythm is little understood in the English-speaking world—witness the welter of confusion in current discussion of the rhythms of English verse—and is little studied even as a part of musical theory. One may therefore, with reserves to be mentioned presently, commend the book to those who are interested in musical rhythm, but do not care to give the time necessary for working out the subject in a foreign language. The reviewer is not musician enough to follow with entire confidence all the musical illustrations. Where he does feel competent the analysis commends itself, although it sometimes appears to him that Aristoxenos would have pushed the analysis a step farther. For example, a kolon of seven feet he did not allow; and in number 83, for instance, a Chopin nocturne (Op. 15, No. 3), where Mr. Williams would make one kolon of the seven opening bars, Aristoxenos would certainly have found two members, of four and three respectively. The treble melody alone does not mark the division clearly; the change in the bass does. The 'Erlikönig,' example 79, is analysed throughout clearly and instructively.

The serious reserves that must be made concern the classical scholar rather than the musician. Not only is Mr. Williams unacquainted with the work done on Greek rhythm since Westphal, he knows only a part of Westphal's work. Hence he does not recognise that what he regards as important in Laloy's little dissertation was all suggested by Westphal. He is unaware, also, that Westphal's 'cyclic dactyl' has been shown to have no basis in ancient theory; the evidence on which Westphal relied vanishes under criticism. Yet modern music employs abundantly the form to which Westphal gave that name. Mr. Williams goes astray sadly in translating technical Greek. Perhaps the worst case is on p. 24. What could one make, without the Greek, of the sentence, 'According

to Phaedrus, rhythm is some measured thesis of syllables, placed together in certain ways? What is meant is 'a measured collocation (or setting) of syllables that have certain relations to one another.' The definition is of course late and clumsy. The discussion on p. 25 shows that it is far from clear to Mr. Williams. Indeed, the usual confusion as to the essence of rhythm appears in the opening paragraphs of the preface. This confusion is sure to make havoc the moment one departs from the simple Aristoxenian *χρόνων τάξις ἀφωρισμένη*, 'temporum inter se ordo quidam.'

THOMAS D. GOODELL.

*Yale University,
New Haven, Conn., U.S.A.*

Les Épistratèges: Contribution à l'Étude des Institutions de l'Égypte Gréco-Romaine. 1 vol. 8vo. Pp. xv + 201. Genève: Georg and Co., 1911. 10 fr.

THE position of the epistrategus in Egypt was one of considerable dignity and importance; in the Roman period it was always held by Romans of equestrian rank. It is therefore a little surprising that the explicit evidence concerning it is comparatively scanty; how scanty, in many respects at all events, one realises in reading the present monograph, a thesis for the doctorate of Geneva. The volume is divided into two parts, dealing respectively with the Ptolemaic and with the Roman periods; naturally, for the position of the epistrategus differed considerably in the two. Under the Ptolemies there was, as the author convincingly establishes, but one epistrategus, for the Thebaid, and, while he fulfilled certain civil functions, his main importance and probably his original *raison d'être* were military. The office seems, in fact, as the author argues (but further evidence may invalidate this conclusion), to have been created in consequence of disturbances in Upper Egypt. Under the Romans, on the contrary, we find three epistrategi, and their functions were exclusively civil. The author, collecting the available evidence, discusses in turn the various problems which present themselves;

and though he is often compelled to leave questions open, he has certainly added to our knowledge on several points. Sometimes his arguments do not carry conviction. Thus his tentative conclusion on p. 36 that the puzzling title of *θηβάρχη* once or twice given to the Ptolemaic epistrategus was an arbitrary and unofficial epithet only 'due à la fantaisie du graveur' must be regarded as very dubious. The question is a difficult one; but it seems unlikely that a private person, desiring to pay a compliment to the epistrategus, would attribute to him unofficially a title actually borne by an official of much inferior rank. On p. 73 the author perhaps takes *τροφεὺς καὶ τιθηνός* too literally; may not the phrase have been, in some cases at least, a merely honorary title, like *συγγενής*?

The volume concludes with an appendix containing lists of the known epistrategi, which will be of value for purposes of reference, and there are also indices of passages discussed and of personal names.

H. I. BELL.

British Museum.

AMERICAN SCHOOL EDITIONS.

Tac. Hist. I. 2. By F. G. MOORE, Professor of Classical Philology in Columbia University. Macmillan and Co. *Hor. Odes and Epodes.* By P. SHOREY and G. J. LAING, Professor in the University of Chicago. Students' Series of Latin Classics: *Cicero's Letters.* By E. RIESS, Department of Classics, High School, Brooklyn. Macmillan and Co.

PROFESSOR MOORE'S aim has been—so he tells us in his preface—to 'present Tacitus' more striking modes of expression, not as grammatical curiosities, to be viewed with indifference through the dusty glass of a museum case, but as highly specialised tools, shaped for his own use by the master-workman.' How far the editor has been allowed by the necessary brevity of a school edition to carry out this laudable intention his readers will judge. The notes are dry, business-like, and well adapted for purposes of examination. The introduction is more am-

bitious: it aims at doing justice with brevity to aspects of Tacitus which have been treated at greater length by previous commentators. Here again the editor wastes no words; but it is a question whether the plums of criticism (his own, and others) with which he regales his readers are always wholesome. Some at any rate are a good deal more so than others. Perhaps it is illuminating to compare Livy with Raphael and Tacitus with Michael Angelo. But in view of the published works of Cicero and Lucretius it is rather misleading to say that 'Roman prose in the Ciceronian age was still eminently unimaginative. A sharp line was drawn between the vocabulary of prose and poetry.'

Professor Shorey and Laing have published an edition of the *Odes* and *Epodes*, the notes of which are distinctly 'literary,' in the sense that parallel passages and phrases are freely quoted. Style and not history (one is thankful for hearing no more about inner meanings and Muraena's conspiracy) is the main subject of the introduction too: the Professors write with erudition and, what is less usual with editors, judgment. I hope, however, that we shall continue to read Horatian sapphics as the introduction says only 'beginners' do, *i.e.* without attempting to give full vocal value to a system of trochaic dipodies interrupted by a cyclic dactyl; that is, if the sapphic is meant to run, and not to limp.

Dr. Riess is an ambitious man. In a small school edition of selected letters of Cicero he summarises the history of ancient letter-writing, and employs more than a little pedantry to make it into a regular science. Nor is he very convincing about the *sermo cotidianus*. If we are to suppose that there was such a vulgar speech with a special vocabulary and syntax of its own, it is not very likely that the *sermo cotidianus*—the careless slang of the man in the street—was represented by Cicero's letters to Atticus.

These American school editions aim at too much. You really cannot, without misleading your readers, get the main facts of Cicero's life, with the necessary framework of allusions to

complicated contemporary events, into three thousand words or so. One is reminded of the Extension lecturer who professed to exhaust the whole subject of the Roman Empire in three-quarters of an hour. However, it is a sporting attempt; and I suppose American schoolboys must know—or be told—something about everything. Dr. Riess' notes are clear, if they do not add to the interest of the text.

G.

THE OEDIPUS TYRANNUS AT CAMBRIDGE.

THE production of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* at Cambridge in November last calls for more than a passing notice. In the first place some new features had been introduced into the stage arrangements. The Chorus occupied the main part of the stage, upon which only the minor characters occasionally trespassed: Oedipus and Iocasta spoke from a pedestal or bastion beside a flight of steps leading to the palace entrance. The whole scene suggested the Propylaea. For this scheme, as good an adaptation of a modern stage as could have been devised, we believe Mr. Scholfield was responsible. The Chorus were kept more in touch with the principal character and were no longer left as passive spectators in the wings.

Some boldness was observable in the costumes of the Chorus: the colours were strong and even harsh, but the combined effect was certainly satisfactory. There was also more vigour and liveliness in the choric movements—so much so, in fact, that it had apparently been deemed suitable to make up the choreutae as youthful or middle-aged 'elders.' Only two were distinctly γέροντες in appearance.

The general standard of the acting was higher than usual. Twenty or thirty years ago it was little, if at all, superior to that of the average School Speech Day. The *Oedipus* of Mr. J. E. Scott was, perhaps, the finest individual performance, at least of a leading part, that we have ever had at these revivals. In minor parts the record is still held by Mr. Ponsonby's Corpse in the *Frogs* at Oxford in 1890.

A comparison is inevitable between the Cambridge performance and Dr. Reinhardt's recent production. But comparison is hardly possible. Dr. Reinhardt had turned an austere tragedy into a sentimental drama, and the Cambridge managers with this warning before them were able to avoid similar errors. How much more effectively on the Cambridge stage the reticence of Iocasta intensified the horror of her sudden flight!

The general effect of the tragedy upon the audience was, except at one important point, as nearly as possible the effect which Sophocles intended to produce. The darkened stage at the final appearance of Oedipus was a concession to modern squeamishness. Perhaps we could not have endured it in full limelight. Having made this concession, might not the managers have curtailed the final scene? It was very evident that the effect was to weary the audience and dismiss them not horrified, but a trifle bored. If one may judge from Jebb's introduction, when the play was produced at the Théâtre Français in 1881, the final scene must have been shortened, for the parting of Oedipus from his children 'almost immediately' succeeded his entrance.

One other awkwardness was strikingly emphasised by the performance. The speech of Teiresias at 447 revealed so much that it seemed incredible that Oedipus should quietly retire at 462 without opening his lips. Surely, even if he remained deaf to the broad hints of the prophet, he could not have passed over such a speech without an angry retort. We believe it was Sir G. Young who first suggested that Oedipus retired at the beginning of Teiresias' speech, and that the latter, being blind, continued his denunciation as though Oedipus were present. Some such device would have smoothed over a clumsy dramatic situation.

Lastly, Professor Stanford's music, which, if we remember rightly, gave complete satisfaction in 1887, was felt to be too obtrusive in 1912. May we not hope that the next production at Cambridge will attempt as near an approximation to Greek simplicity as the modern musical ear will permit?

THE *IPHIGENIA IN TAURIS* AT SHEFFIELD.

AMONG other incidents of the highly successful meeting of the Classical Association at Sheffield, on January 2 to 4, the performance of the *Iphigenia in Tauris* by the University Dramatic Society deserves separate notice. In Professor Murray's beautiful version the play bids fair to become a standing part of the training of Schools and Universities in this country for many years to come. It was admirably done at Sheffield, and especial thanks are due to the President of the Society, Mr. A. Holden, Mathematical Lecturer in the University, who was responsible for the thoughtful and efficient stage management, and for a performance of the difficult part of Orestes, which was both spirited and dignified. Miss Bradbury was hardly less delightful in the very difficult title-rôle, and completely held the audience from her first appearance, and more than once moved it deeply. The chorus, too, were ably led and had been carefully trained, and the only room for regret was that the charming incidental music which was attached to a few of choral odes had not been extended into a complete musical accompaniment. It is very difficult to appreciate even such exquisite poetry as Mr. Murray's choral versions when they are either recited in unison or chanted either with no music or in recitative with a hardly perceptible melody. A final word of congratulation must be offered upon the striking and beautiful scene-painting which occupied the back of the stage, the work of Mr. W. Purchon, the University Lecturer on Architecture. The arrangements for stage lighting also, which were carried out by members of the Society, and the graceful dresses enhanced the richness and charm of the whole performance.

There can be no doubt that such presentations of great ancient plays in English dress do much to stimulate interest in Classical study, and to kindle a desire in the abler students to read them in the original, and the performance furnished a happy comment

upon the plea which the Master of Trinity had advanced in his Presidential address, for the study of good translations of Classical authors as an integral part of English education. All lovers of Greek who have witnessed such a performance will be more grateful than ever to Professor Gilbert Murray. But if one petition to him might be framed after repeated experience of his translation, it would be that in future versions, to which we all look forward eagerly, he would allow himself the greater freedom of blank verse (instead of the rhymed couplet) for the narrative, and still more for the dialogue parts of the play. The persistency of certain rhymes, such as 'home' and 'foam,' 'seas' and 'Symplegades' does seem, to some of us at least, to detract something from the reality of the drama, and here and there, as in the last words of Thoas, the necessity of rhyme has produced rather forceless diction. This seemed to be a feeling shared by many of the audience at Sheffield, but such small possibilities of criticism did not hinder in the least the delight which the performance gave, or its value to education in every sense of the word.

POGGIO AND ASCONIUS.

MR. GARROD, in the December number of the *Classical Review*, draws attention to the interesting statement of Pithoeus that he saw at St. Gall the receipt which Poggio gave for the MS. of Asconius, 'which was taken to Italy.' He says that the evidence is 'not conclusive even for Asconius,' but proceeds to argue that Poggio may have adopted for the *Silvae* 'the same procedure as he adopted with Asconius.'

The objection to such a view is that there is no trace of any infiltration of readings from the Sangallensis in the later Italian copies, all of which are derived from the Madrid MS., which appears to be Poggio's transcript. From this, and from the copies of the Sangallensis made in Switzerland by Sozomenus and Bartolommeo da Montepulciano, all our knowledge of Asconius is derived. Also, in his letters no mention is made of the Sangallensis itself, but

only of his copy, *Asconius meus*. On the other hand, in the case of the Cluni MS. of Cicero he refers to the *liber quem detuli ex monasterio Cluniacensi*, and fresh readings from it appear in the later Italian copies.

The solution appears to be very simple. We know from the colophon of Sozomenus that he copied Asconius in Constance, and from a colophon of Poggio preserved in Vat. Urbin. 327 and Ambros. B. 153 *sup.* that he transcribed Quintilian in the same city. Nothing could be more natural than that Poggio should give a receipt to Hainricus de Gundelfingen, then Abbot of St. Gall, if the MSS. were sent to Constance for his use. If, on the other hand, the MSS. were to be taken to Italy, the worthy Abbot would have been a simpleton to suppose that a receipt would be of any value.

While therefore I credit the statement of Pithoeus that he saw the receipt in question, I consider the words 'qui fut porté en Italie lorsque l'on retournoit du Concile de Constance' to be an interpretation of his own, and destitute of value. It was only on rare occasions that Poggio was able to secure ancient MSS. That of Ammianus Marcellinus was brought from Fulda to the Council of Constance by the Abbot Johannes de Merlaw and passed into the possession of Cardinal Colonna, a kinsman of Martin V. Sabbadini has recently made a suggestion (which previously occurred to myself) that the Cluni MS. of Cicero found its way to Constance in the same way. As a rule, however, he had to be content with copies. The monks, whom he denounces as *barbari* and *onagri*, were very reluctant to part with their books. Thus in 1429 he had great difficulty about getting on loan from Monte Cassino the Frontinus which is still there, and was obliged to return it quickly. Thus, he says to a friend, *si liber fuisset meus, eum ego tibi condonassem: cum vero sit Monasterii Cassinensis, nunquid credis Abbatem decemio expectaturum fuisse?* The Abbot, without doubt, must have insisted upon a receipt, and could make his voice heard in Rome.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

* * *Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.*

- Anderton (B.)** Catalogue of Greek and Latin Classics in Newcastle Public Library. 10" x 7½". Pp. xiv + 269. Illustrated. Newcastle-on-Tyne: A. Dickson, 1912.
- Aristotle (De Motu Animalium and De Incessu Animalium)** Translated into English by A. S. L. Farquharson. Completing Vol. V. 9" x 6". Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. 2s. net.
- Bennett (F. M.)** Religious Cults associated with the Amazons. 9" x 6". Pp. 79. Columbia: University Press; and London: Henry Frowde, 1912. 5s. 6d. net.
- Cagnat (R.)** L'Armée Romaine d'Afrique, et l'Occupation Militaire de l'Afrique sous les Empereurs. 1ère Partie. 11" x 9". Pp. xxvii + 423. Paris, Imprimerie Nationale: E. Leroux, 1912.
- Catullus (Index Verborum)** By M. N. Wetmore. 10" x 6½". Pp. vii + 115. Yale: University Press; and London: Henry Frowde, 1912. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Curcio (G.)** Q. Orazio Flacco, studiato in Italia dal secolo XIII. al XVIII. 8" x 5¼". Pp. viii + 338. Catania: Battiato, 1913. L. 4.
- Diels (H.)** Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, Griechisch und Deutsch. 9½" x 6". 2 vols. Pp. vii + 345 and xvi + 434. Berlin: Weidmann, 1912. M. 9.
- Friedlander (J.)** Die Chadhirlegende und der Alexanderroman. 9" x 5¼". Pp. xxiv + 338. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. M. 12.
- Garrod (H. W.)** The Oxford Book of Latin Verse. 6½" x 4½". Pp. xliii + 531. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. Cloth, 6s. net; India paper, 7s. 6d. net.
- Gunning (P. G.)** De Ceorum Fabulis Antiquissimis Quaestiones Selectae I. 9½" x 6½". Pp. 90. Amsterdam: J. Müller, 1912.
- Hardy (E. G.)** Roman Laws and Charters, Translated, with Introduction and Notes. 9" x 5¼". Pp. 184 + 158. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Hesiod.** See Pizzigalli.
- Homeri Ilias I.-XII. cum prolegomenis etc.** Edidit J. van Leeuwen. 9½" x 6½". Pp. lxxviii + 450. Leyden: A. W. Sijthoff, 1912. Cloth, M. 9.
- Horace (Odes)** Text, with Translation in English Verse by W. S. Marris. 5" x 4". Pp. 134. Oxford: University Press, 1912. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.
- See Curcio.
- Johannis Stobaei Anthologium.** Vol. V., by Otto Hense. 8" x 5". Pp. xxxvii + 677-1157. Berlin: Weidmann, 1912. M. 18.
- Jones (H. S.)** A Catalogue of the Ancient Sculptures preserved in the Municipal Collections of Rome. Part I.: Text, 9¼" x 6", pp. viii + 419; Part II.: 94 collotype plates, 13½" x 11¼". Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. Cloth, Part I., 18s. net; Part II., 50s. net; together 63s. net.
- Lysias (Orations)** By C. Hude. Oxford Text. 7½" x 5". Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Müller (A.)** Ästhetischer Kommentar zu den Tragödien des Sophocles, mit einem Lichtdruckbild. 2te Auflage. 8½" x 5½". Pp. viii + 534. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1913. M. 6.60.
- Murray (G.)** Four Stages of Greek Religion. Lectures delivered at Columbia University. 9" x 6". Pp. 222. Columbia: University Press; and London: Henry Frowde, 1912. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Mussehl (Joachim)** De lucretiani libri primi condicione ac retractatione. 9" x 6¼". Pp. 182. Tempelhof, Berlin: G. Schmidt.
- Norden (E.)** Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede. 9" x 5¼". Pp. ix + 410. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. M. 12.
- Nouvelles Archives des Missions Scientifiques**, etc. Choix de Rapports et Instructions publié sous les auspices du Ministère de l'Instruction et des Beaux-Arts. Nouvelle Série. Fascicule 3. 10" x 6½". Pp. 112. With illustrations. Paris, Imprimerie Nationale: E. Leroux, 1911.
- Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft.** XV. Halbband. VIII. 1. Helikon-Hestia. 10" x 6½". Pp. 1311. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1912. M. 15.
- Pizzagalli (A. M.)** Milo e Poesia nella Grecia Antica. Saggio sulla Teogonia di Esiodo. 8" x 5¼". Pp. 258. Catania: Battiato, 1913. L. 5.
- Plato (Ion), with Introduction and Notes** by J. M. Macgregor. 6½" x 4½". Pp. xxiii + 45. Cambridge: University Press, 1912. Cloth, 2s.
- (Apologie, Kriton) Ausgewählte Dialoge, Band IV. Zweite Auflage, von Hans Petersen. 8" x 5". Pp. iv + 84. Berlin: Weidmann, 1912. M. 1.
- Polybius.** By R. Laqueur. 9" x 6". Pp. viii + 309. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. M. 10.
- Robert (C.)** Die Spürhunde, Ein Satyrspiel von Sophocles. Für die Aufführung des Lauchstedter Theatervereins im Juni 1913. 8½" x 5½". Pp. 24. Berlin: Weidmann, 1912. Pf. 60.

- Rothe* (C.) Der augenblickliche Stand der homerischen Frage. 9" x 6". Pp. 94. Berlin: Weidmann, 1912. M. 2.
- Schonack* (W.) Der Horaz-Unterricht. 8½" x 5½". Pp. x + 144. Berlin: Weidmann, 1912. M. 3.
- Sophokles* (Electra) Band V. Zehnte Auflage von E. Bruhn. 8" x 5". Pp. 214. Berlin: Weidmann, 1912. M. 2.
- Spiess* (H.) Menschenart und Heldenthum in Homers Ilias. 8½" x 5½". Pp. vi + 314. Paderborn: Schöningh. M. 4.50.
- Stark* (A. R.) The Christology in the Apostolic Fathers. (Doctor's Dissertations.) 9½" x 6½". Pp. xii + 60. University of Chicago Press: Cambridge University Press, 1912.
- Tacitus* (Annals, V., VI., XI., XII.) Abridged from larger work of H. Furneaux by H. Pittman. 7½" x 5". Pp. lxxiii + text + 112 (notes), with maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Teubner's Texts.* Bacchylidis Carmina cum Fragmentis (Blass), pp. lxxxii + 154, M. 2.80.
- Claudius Ptolemaeus Handbuch der Astronomie (2^{ter} Band) (Manilius), M. 8. 6¾" x 4¾". Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913.
- Virgil* (Georgics) Text and English Verse Translation, by A. S. Way. 7½" x 5". Pp. 117. London: Macmillan and Co., 1912. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.
- Von Sphettos* (A.) Philologische Untersuchungen. XXI. Heft. 9½" x 6". Pp. xii + 328. Berlin: Weidmann, 1912. M. 10.
- Werner* (H.) Lateinische Grammatik für höhere Schulen. 9½" x 6½". Pp. xvi + 271. Zweite Auflage. Dresden: L. Ehlermann, 1912. Cloth.
- West* (A. J.) Wit and Wisdom from Martial. Translation and Notes. 6½" x 5". Pp. xv + 123. Hampstead: Priory Press, 1912. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.
- White* (J. W.) The Verse of Greek Comedy. 9" x 5¾". Pp. xxx + 480. London: Macmillan and Co., 1912. Cloth, 12s. net.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf* (U. von) Die Spürhunde des Sophokles. 10½" x 7". Pp. 28. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. M. 1.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. Members receive a copy of the annual 'Proceedings' of the Association and of the Year's Work in Classical Studies (both post free). They may also obtain the CLASSICAL REVIEW and CLASSICAL QUARTERLY at the reduced price of 7s. and 9s. a year respectively (post free), provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public, viz. 7s. 6d. for the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 12s. 6d. for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY, or 18s. for the two Journals jointly, post free in each case.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Secretary, Mr. M. O. B. Caspari, University College, London; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. G. Warre Cornish, The University, Manchester; Mr. R. W. Reynolds, King Edward's School, Birmingham; Mr. K. Forbes, 135, Chatham Street, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 5, Park Avenue, Mapperley Road, Nottingham; Miss E. Newcomb, 19, St. Helena Road, Redland, Bristol; and Mr. R. H. Soltan, The University, Bristol; Mr. J. M. MacGregor, Bedford College, London, W.; and the Rev. Father Ailingier, S.J., St. Xavier's College, Bombay.